FIFTH PROGRESS REPORT ON THE COMPENSATED WORK THERAPY (CWT) / VETERANS INDUSTRIES (VI) PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR 2001

July 2002

Catherine Leda Seibyl, MSN MPH
Project Director

Rick Baldino
Program Analyst

Linda Corwel
Program Analyst

Sharon Medak
Associate Project Director

Robert Rosenheck, MD
Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is a therapeutic work-for-pay program authorized in 1976 by Public Law 94-581. The major goals of the program are: 1) to use remunerative work to maximize a veteran's level of functioning; 2) to prepare veterans for successful re-entry into the community as productive citizens, and; 3) to provide a structured daily activity to those veterans with severe and chronic disabling physical and/or mental conditions. The program has grown substantially over the years from 76 programs in FY 1994 to 101 program site locations in FY 2001. During FY 2001, nearly 13,700 veterans participated in the program and they earned a total of $33.4 million dollars.

This report, the fifth in a series of performance reports, offers information for program managers at both the national level and VISN level as well as the local medical center level.

Monitoring data indicate that the CWT/VI program provides treatment to veterans with significant health care problems and social-vocational deficits. During FY 2001, veterans in the CWT/VI program had a mean age of 46.5 years and 4.2% were female. The majority of participants are minorities; 46.8% are African American; 4.5% are Hispanic; 2.3% are of other ethnic backgrounds, and only 44.7% are White. Only 7.9% are married. Over 90% had completed 12 years of education and 41.7% had at least some college. While 44.3% of veterans reported that their usual employment pattern in the past three years was full-time competitive employment, almost nine out of ten veterans reported not working at all in the month prior to admission. Veterans admitted to the program continue to be virtually without resources as mean monthly incomes of veterans have dropped from $347 in FY 1993 to $229 in FY 2000 and six out of ten veterans are homeless. Substance abuse is the most prevalent illness as 86.5% of veterans have an alcohol and/or drug problem and over half reported to have lost at least one job in the past due to their substance use. In FY 2001 over two-thirds of veterans (35.8%) were diagnosed with a serious mental illness. This represents a drop of nearly 10% from 45.1% in FY 2000. A similar drop was also noted for veterans dually diagnosed with both a substance abuse disorder and a serious mental illness (36.3% in FY 2000 vs. 28.4% in FY 2001).

Veterans discharged during FY 2001 worked an average of 25.9 hours per week, had an average hourly wage of $5.72 (57 cents above minimum wage) and 78.2% had a supported employment/transitional work experience placement while in CWT/VI. Upon completion of their participation, nearly four out of ten veterans (41.4%) had arrangements to be in competitive employment (full- or part-time) while an additional 4.3% had arrangements to be in some type of constructive activity (e.g. VA's Incentive Therapy, student, trainee or unpaid volunteer) and 10.9% were retired and/or disabled. During the past 8 fiscal years, there has been an increase in the percentage of veterans showing improvement in virtually all clinical areas (e.g. alcohol problems, drug problems, mental health problems and medical problems) and work performance areas (e.g. attendance and punctuality, acceptance of supervision, relationship with co-workers, productivity and quality of production).

Performance as measured by 13 critical monitors was used to compare the operation of individual sites and to identify performance outliers. The norm used to evaluate the performance of individual sites on each critical monitor was either the national program mean, or in the case of outcome measures, the national median. Outcome measures were risk adjusted for differences in baseline veteran characteristics that are related to the outcomes. Eleven of the 101 program site locations were outliers on 5 of the 12 critical monitors

Comprehensive workload data summaries for VA's entire Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR) using data from the outpatient care file in Austin, Texas indicate that altogether 38,360 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2001 and 22,053 of them (57.5%) received services from the CWT/VI program.

As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI will be an important element in fostering community adjustment and functional rehabilitation of veterans disabled by psychiatric or addictive disorders, particularly CWT/VI transitional work placements that are community-based.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. The Compensated Work Therapy / Veterans Industries Program

The Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program is a therapeutic work-for-pay program in which private sector businesses, or Federal Agencies, contract with VA for work to be performed by veterans. Authorized in 1976 by Public Law 94-581, the major goals of the program are: 1) to use remunerative work to maximize a veteran's level of functioning; 2) to prepare veterans for successful re-entry into the community as productive citizens, and; 3) to provide a structured daily activity to those veterans with severe and chronic disabling physical and/or mental conditions (Fountaine & Howard, 1987).

The CWT/VI Program has grown substantially over the years from 76 programs in FY 1994 to 101 program site locations in FY 2001. During FY 2001, VA Central Office reported that nearly 13,700 veterans had been served in the program and these veterans had earned a total of $33.4 million dollars through their participation in CWT/VI. As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI continues to be an important element in the veteran's overall rehabilitation treatment plan which may also include residential treatment and medical, psychiatric and/or substance abuse outpatient services.

VA medical centers sponsoring CWT/VI programs have two basic types of work therapy models. The first is a traditional sheltered workshop model where subcontracted work is brought to the workshop (located on VA medical center grounds and/or in the community) for completion. Work performed in the workshop most often involves assembly, packaging, collating and/or fabrication, and veterans are paid on a piece rate basis. The second work therapy model is the supported employment/transitional work experience. Supported employment/transitional work experience sites are located in the community and/or a government setting - primarily the VA medical center (e.g. Environmental Management Service). Veterans participating in supported employment/transitional work experience placements receive direct supervision from the customer/contractee. CWT/VI clinicians visit the placement site regularly and provide additional supervision as needed. Remuneration for both the workshop and supported employment/transitional work experience models are commensurate with wages paid in the community for essentially the same quality and quantity of work. Although the majority of CWT/VI program sites operate both work therapy models, the trend has been towards the utilization of the supported employment model as the increasingly favored evidence-based practice (Bond, Becker, Drake, et al, 2001). Several of the more recently established CWT/VI programs have instituted the supported employment/transitional work experience model alone.

B. Organization of the Veterans Health Administration

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA) is organized into 22 semi-autonomous

Veterans Integrated Service Networks (VISNs)[1]. Each VISN is charged with developing cost-effective health care programs that are responsive both to the national mission of VA, and to local circumstances and trends in health care delivery.   Although administered independently, the VISNs are also accountable through centralized monitoring of performance and health care outcomes. This report, the fifth in a series of performance reports, offers information for program managers at both the national level and VISN level, as well as at the level of the local medical center.

C. Evaluation and Monitoring Efforts

Since 1993 the Northeast Program Evaluation Center (NEPEC) in West Haven, CT has monitored the CWT/VI Program. The goals of the monitoring are to 1) provide a description of the status and needs of veterans currently in CWT/VI, 2) assure program accountability, and 3) identify ways to refine or change the program, nationally and at specific sites. Key findings from previous reports (Seibyl, Baldino, Corwel, Medak and Rosenheck, 2001; Seibyl, Rosenheck, Corwel and Medak, 2000; Seibyl, Rosenheck, Corwel and Medak, 1999; Seibyl, Rosenheck, Corwel and Medak, 1997; Leda, Rosenheck, Corwel and Medak, 1995) have concluded that:

- The program is providing treatment to veterans with significant health care problems, social-vocational deficits and without basic resources. Substance abuse is the most prevalent illness as nearly 86.5% of veterans have an alcohol and/or drug problem and over half reported to have lost at least one job in the past due to their substance use.

- Upon completion of their participation, nearly 4 out of 10 veterans discharged had arrangements to be in competitive employment.

- Comprehensive workload data for VA's entire Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR) indicate that 31,753 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2000 and 61.6% of them received services from the CWT/VI Program.

Tracking the ongoing performance of CWT/VI program is accomplished through collecting information on every veteran participating in CWT/VI treatment. The Veteran Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (see Appendix A) is completed on every veteran admitted to the CWT/VI program. Implemented on June 1, 1993 and revised in September 2000, the form consists of two sections. The first section is completed on or as near to the day of admission to CWT/VI as possible. In a face-to-face interview with the veteran, the CWT/VI clinician documents veteran demographic and military service characteristics as well as residential, vocational and income status. At the end of the first section, clinicians record the avenue of entry into the CWT/VI program and pertinent diagnostic information on the veterans' psychiatric and medical status.   The second section is completed at the conclusion of CWT/VI treatment. The clinician records the veteran's length of participation, mode of discharge, total earnings and hours worked and, the veterans' arrangements for employment and housing after discharge. In addition, for six work performance areas and four clinical areas, CWT/VI clinicians note whether the veteran demonstrated any clinical change

---

[1] During FY 2002, VISNs 13 and 14 dissolved and merged into one VISN, VISN 23.

(deteriorated, unchanged or improved) during his/her CWT/VI treatment.

1. Data Used to Assess CWT/VI Program Performance

The performance of each CWT/VI program is assessed with three types of measures: 1) a program monitoring compliance measure, 2) descriptive measures, and; 3) critical monitor measures. The program monitoring compliance measure assesses compliance of individual CWT/VI programs with the collection of monitoring data. Descriptive measures are those that provide basic information on the characteristics of the veterans being served by the program (e.g. age, marital status, race, etc). Critical monitor measures evaluate how successful programs are at meeting the goals and objectives of the CWT/VI Program as set forth by programmatic guidelines.

2. Selection of Critical Monitors

Outlined below are three objectives that reflect the goals of the CWT/VI Program. For each objective, the associated critical monitors are noted. The critical monitors cover three principal areas: 1) veteran characteristics (the extent to which the CWT/VI Program reaches the seriously mentally ill veteran population); 2) program participation (i.e. mode of discharge, hours worked, hourly wage), and; 3) outcomes (i.e. employment arrangements at the time of discharge, percent clinically improved).

Objective 1: The CWT/VI Program serves veterans with psychological or physical disabilities, particularly the underserved disabled veteran population.
Critical monitor selected to assess this objective is:
- Percent of veterans with a serious mental illness

Objective 2: The CWT/VI Program provides psychosocial (or physical) rehabilitation through remunerative work to veterans in order to encourage the development of good work habits, emphasizing attendance, reliability, punctuality, productivity, craftsmanship, creativity, personal responsibilities and acceptance of supervision.
Critical monitors selected to assess this objective are:
- Percent of veterans who had a mutually agreed/planned discharge from CWT/VI
- Percent of veterans who failed to comply with CWT/VI program requirements
- Average hours worked per week
- Average hourly wage
- Average work improvement score

Objective 3: The CWT/VI Program provides treatment directed towards increasing the veteran's chances for adjustment and reentry into the community, including returning to the workforce and, preventing deterioration of medical, psychiatric and substance abuse problems.

Critical monitors selected to assess this objective are:

- Among veterans with alcohol problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with drug problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with mental health problems, percent improved
- Among veterans with medical problems, percent improved
- Percent competitively employed (part- or full-time) after discharge
- Percent unemployed after discharge
- Percent employment status unknown after discharge

3. Determining Outliers on Critical Monitors

Generally, the average (or median) of all CWT/VI sites is used as the norm for evaluating the performance of each individual site. Those sites that are one standard deviation above or below the mean in the undesirable direction are considered outliers. Data from outcome measures have been risk adjusted for baseline characteristics. Selection of these baseline characteristics differs depending on the outcome measure, but they include age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses, including serious psychiatric illnesses and substance abuse problems. Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesirable direction after adjusting for baseline measures are considered outliers.

The identification of a site as an outlier on a critical monitor is intended to inform the program director, medical center leadership, network leadership and VA Central Office that the site is divergent from other sites with respect to the critical monitor. Each site is asked to carefully consider the measures on which they are outliers. In some instances this information is used to take corrective action in order to align the site more closely with the mission and goals of the program. In other instances sites have been identified as outliers because of legitimate idiosyncrasies in the operation of the program, which do not warrant corrective action. It must be emphasized that these monitors should not be considered, by themselves, to be indicators of the quality of care delivered at particular sites. They can be used only to identify statistical outliers, the importance of which must be determined by further discussion.

4. Overview of the Monitoring Process

Forms are completed on each veteran discharged from the CWT/VI program and are submitted monthly to NEPEC by program sites. These data are aggregated and reported back to sites on a quarterly basis. Before this progress report was issued, preliminary tables were distributed to CWT/VI program sites. CWT/VI program coordinators and staff reviewed the tables for errors. Data presented in this report have had an opportunity to be reviewed by

CWT/VI staff at each program and by VA Central Office. Data have been corrected or amended where appropriate.

5. *CWT/VI as one Component of the Larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service*

The CWT/VI Program is only one component of the larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service (PSR), a section of the Mental Health Strategic Health Group. Other programs within PSR include Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence (CWT/TR)[2], Incentive Therapy (IT)[3] and Vocational Assistance / Counseling.

Using FY 2001 data from VA's outpatient care file in Austin Texas, the following 9 stop codes were examined: 574 (mental health - CWT), 532 (psychosocial rehab-individual; used in the CWT/TR program), 559 (psychosocial rehab-group; used in the CWT/TR program), 208 (rehab medicine – CWT), 573 (Incentive Therapy – group), 207 (rehab medicine – Incentive Therapy), 535 (mental health - vocational assistance), 575 (mental health – vocational assistance group) and 213 (rehab medicine – vocational assistance).

D. Organization of This Report

This report is divided into two sections. The first section examines changes in the program, over time, from FY 1993 when the monitoring first began through to FY 2001. In addition, data on critical monitors are presented by VISN, and finally, site data is presented on the descriptive characteristics of veterans admitted to the program, the extent to which veterans participated in the program and veteran outcomes at the time of discharge.

The second section of this report contains three appendices. Appendix A contains a copy of the monitoring data collection form. Appendix B contains 36 data tables derived from the monitoring data collection system. And finally, Appendix C contains summary data of the psychosocial rehabilitation services received by veterans as documented by stop codes recorded in VA's outpatient treatment file in Austin Texas during FY 2001.

---

[2] The CWT/TR program is a work-based Psychosocial Residential Rehabilitation Treatment Program (PRRTP) offering a 24-hour setting for veterans involved in CWT/VI. The program utilizes a residential community, peer and professional support, with a strong emphasis on increasing personal responsibility. Veterans contribute (using their CWT/VI earnings) to the cost of operating ad maintaining the residences and are responsible for planning purchasing and preparing their own meals. For more information on the CWT/TR program see the Fifth Progress Report on the Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program, Seibyl, Sieffert, Medak and Rosenheck, 2002).

[3] Incentive Therapy program provides pre-vocational activity combined with intensive case management. This program is ideal for veterans requiring a long term highly structured pre-vocational environment.

CHAPTER II
THE CLINICAL OPERATION

A. National Performance

Tables 1 - 6 in Appendix B present summary national data on number of veterans served for whom monitoring data were collected, veteran characteristics, program participation, and discharge outcomes for fiscal years 1993 - 2001. Highlighted below are key findings:

Number of Veterans Served

- During FY 2001, data were collected on 7,443 veterans discharged from the CWT/VI Program (Table 1). These 7,443 veterans for whom monitoring data were collected represented 81.8% of all discharges reported to VA Central Office (Table 10).

Veteran Characteristics

- The majority of veterans admitted to the CWT/VI Program are being referred by either VA outpatient programs or domiciliary care programs (40% and 34% respectively) (Table 2).
  `

- During FY 2001, veterans in the CWT/VI Program had a mean age of 46.5 years and 4.2% were female. The majority of participants are minorities; 46.8% are African American; 4.5% are Hispanic; 3% are of other ethnic backgrounds, and only 45.7% are White. Only 7.9% are married; 63.7% are separated, widowed or divorced, and 28.4% have never married. Over 90% completed 12 years of education, and 41.7% had at least some college (Table 2).

- Veterans admitted to the CWT/VI continue to be without resources. Mean monthly incomes in the month prior to admission have dropped from $347 in FY 1993 to $215 in FY 2001 and six out of ten veterans (60.6%) are homeless (Table 3).

- The program is admitting a greater proportion of veterans who have had full-time competitive employment experience. In FY 1993, 31.1% of veterans reported that their usual employment pattern in the past three years was full-time competitive employment as compared to 44.3% in FY 2001 (Table 3).

- Substance abuse is the most prevalent illness in this population as 86.9% of veterans were diagnosed with either an alcohol problem (75.4%) and/or a drug problem (60.4%) (Table 4). In addition, over half of veterans (58.4%) reported that they had lost at least one job due to their abuse of substances (Table 3).

- The proportion of veterans diagnosed with a serious mental illness dropped by nearly 10% from 45.1% in FY 2000 to 35.8% in FY 2001. A similar drop was also noted for veterans dually diagnosed with both a substance abuse disorder and a serious mental illness (36.3% in FY 2000 vs. 28.4% in FY 2001) (Table 4).

- Half of the veterans in the CWT/VI Program (51.1%) were reported to have a disabling medical condition (Table 4).

Program Participation

- The proportion of veterans who successfully completed the program during FY 2001 was 51.4% (Table 5).

- On average, during FY 2001, veterans worked 25.9 hours per week in CWT/VI and had an average hourly wage of $5.72, 57 cents above the current minimum wage of $5.15/hour (Table 5).

- The proportion of veterans who had any supported employment/transitional work experience while in CWT/VI has more than doubled from FY 1993 (30.1%) to FY 2001 (78.2%) (Table 5). Only two out of 10 veterans (20.4%) had only a workshop experience in the CWT/VI program.

Outcomes

- During FY 2001, 41.4% of veterans were discharged from CWT/VI with arrangements to be in competitive employment (full- or part-time) (Table 6). An additional 4.3% had arrangements at the time of discharge to be in some type of constructive activity (e.g. VA's Incentive Therapy, student, trainee or unpaid volunteer) and 10.9% were retired and/or disabled (Table 6).

- During the past 8 fiscal years, there has been an increase in the percentage of veterans showing improvement in virtually all clinical areas (e.g. alcohol problems, drug problems, mental health problems and medical problems) and work performance areas (e.g. attendance and punctuality, acceptance of supervision, relationship with co-workers, productivity and quality of production). (Table 6).

B. VISN Performance

CWT/VI Programs are located within every VISN. Tables 7, 8a and 8b in Appendix B report the 12 critical monitor measures by VISN for FY 2001. VISNs whose results are considered "outliers" are identified in Tables 7 and 8b with a darkened box. The performance of all VISNs is used as the norm for evaluating the performance of each individual VISN. Those VISNs that are one standard deviation above or below the mean in the undesirable direction are considered outliers in Table 7. Outcome measures are presented in Tables 8a and 8b. Table 8a reports the raw outcome data by VISN and Table 8b report the

same outcome measures, however, they have been risk adjusted using the same baseline characteristics as described earlier for CWT/VI sites (see Chapter I - determining outliers on critical monitors). VISNs that were statistically different from the median VISN, after risk adjustment, in the undesirable direction on outcome measures are considered outliers.

Table 9 of Appendix B provides a summary of the outlier status of each VISN. A total of 112 outliers out of a total of 286 measurements were identified for the 12 critical monitors across all 22 reporting VISNs. VISNs 1, 9, 11, 17 and 21 had the greatest number of outliers.

C. Site Performance

1. Compliance with Program Monitoring

During FY 2001, 101 CWT/VI program site locations reported discharges to VA Central Office and/or NEPEC[4]. As a matter of policy, CWT/VI sites are required to submit an Annual Report by the tenth day of the completion of each fiscal year. Completed Annual Reports are sent to the attention of the Associate Chief for Psychosocial Rehabilitation in Hampton, Virginia. One component of the Annual Report to VA Central Office requires CWT/VI sites to record the number of patients discharged from CWT/VI for the fiscal year just completed. Table 10 of Appendix C compares the number of discharges reported in the FY 2001 Annual Report to VA Central Office with the number of monitoring forms NEPEC received where the last date worked in CWT/VI occurred during FY 2001. Of these 101 CWT/VI program site locations:

- Five sites reported discharges in the Annual Report, however, did not submit any monitoring data to NEPEC where the veteran's last date worked occurred during FY 2001[5] thus no data will be presented on these programs in this report.

- On average, sites submitted monitoring data on 81.8% of the discharges they reported in their FY 2001 Annual Reports to the Associate Chief for Psychosocial Rehabilitation. Nine CWT/VI program site locations were one standard deviation below the mean on proportion of discharges during FY 2001 for which monitoring data were collected (Table 10).

---

[4] In the past several years, a number of VA medical centers have integrated. As a result, their data were combined in their Annual Report to VA Central Office: East Orange and Lyons reported data as the New Jersey Health Care System; Baltimore, Fort Howard and Perry Point reported data as the Maryland Health Care System; Gainesville and Lake City reported data as the North Florida /South Georgia Health Care System; Des Moines and Knoxville reported data as the Central Iowa Health Care System; Dallas, Bonham and Fort Worth reported data as the North Texas Health Care System, and; Temple and Waco reported data as the Central Texas Health Care System. NEPEC, however, has, where possible, presented data for each CWT/VI program site location. Thus, for medical center facilities that have consolidated, data is presented for each site location and not aggregated for the entire facility. There is only one exception to this and that is the North Florida/South Georgia Health Care System. Data for this facility was aggregated for their two CWT site locations.

[5] The 5 sites are Dublin (VISN 7), Ann Arbor (VISN 11), Kansas City and St. Louis (VISN 15) and Sepulveda (VISN 22).

2. Descriptive Program Measures and Critical Monitor Measures

Tables 11 - 34 of Appendix B report site-specific data for FY 2001. Data are presented for 90 operational program site locations [6]. Eighteen CWT program site locations (2 of the 18 program site locations are part of consolidated medical center facility) were excluded from these tables because they submitted data on fewer than 10 veterans during FY 2001[7]. Critical monitors have been identified in these tables by shaded column titles (e.g. see Table 27 the column labeled "Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge") and sites whose results are considered "outliers" are identified with a darkened box.

Table 35 of Appendix B provides a summary of the outlier status of each site location. A total of 194 outliers out of 1,170 measurements were identified for the 13 critical monitors across all 90 CWT program site locations. Forty of the 90 reporting sites (44.4%) were found to be outliers on one or none of the critical monitors, although 11 of the 90 program site locations were outliers on five or more of the 13 critical monitors.

3. Trend Data on Risk Adjusted Outcome Critical Monitors

The last set of tables in Appendix B, Tables 36a – 36h provide trend data on outcome measures. For each of the eight risk adjusted critical outcome monitors, comparative data from the previous three progress reports, fiscal years 1996, 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001 are presented by site so that trends in program operation can be evaluated.

D. The CWT/VI Program as One Component of the Larger VA Psychosocial Rehabilitation Service

Appendix C contains 10 tables summarizing stop code data (see Chapter I) for Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services (PSR), as documented in VA's outpatient care file. Appendix C1 – Appendix C.5 present summary VISN data, while Appendix C.6 – Appendix C.10 present summary site data.

Altogether, 38,360 individual veterans received PSR services during FY 2001 and these veterans, on average, received 33.1 PSR visits. The overall duration of veteran participation in PSR was approximately 3 months (mean = 89.3 days) as determined by dates of their first recorded and last recorded stop codes during FY 2001. Of the 38,360 veterans, 57.5% (n=22,053) received CWT and/or CWT/TR services; 52.5% (n=20,138) received vocational assistance services and 2.3% (n=8,806) received Incentive Therapy services.

---

[6] NEPEC has presented data for each CWT/VI program site location. Thus, for medical center facilities that have consolidated, data is presented for each site location and not aggregated for the entire facility. There is only one exception to this and that is the North Florida/South Georgia Health Care System. Data for this facility were aggregated.

[7] The 18 CWT site locations excluded from the data tables include: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Fort Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN7, Columbia SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14, Des Moines; VISN 15, Columb ia MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheriden, and; VISN 22 Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Since veterans may receive treatment from a number of programs within the PSR continuum of care, Appendices C5 and C10 report the type service the veterans first received in the PSR continuum of care. Overall, 46% of veterans received CWT and/or CWT/TR services first, 41.5% of veterans received vocational assistance services first and 14.4% of veterans received Incentive Therapy services first.

E. Summary

As VA continues to shift its emphasis of care from costly hospital-based treatment to community care, participation in CWT/VI will be an important element in fostering community adjustment and functional rehabilitation of veterans disabled by psychiatric or addictive disorders, particularly CWT/VI transitional work placements that are community-based.

REFERENCES

Fountaine and Howard. Program Evaluation of the Veterans Administrations
        Therapeutic Work Programs. Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation Studies and
        Evaluation Service, Veterans Administration, December 1987.

Bond, G., Becker, D., Drake, R., et al: Implementing Supported Employment as an
        Evidence-Based Practice. Psychiatric Services, 52: 313-322, 2001.

Leda, C., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Preliminary Information on the
        Monitoring Efforts of the Compensated Work Therapy Program. West Haven, CT;
        Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1995.

Seibyl, C., Baldino, R., Corwel, L., Medak, S. and Rosenheck, R. Fourth Progress Report on
        the Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Program Fiscal
        Year 2000. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2001.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) /
        Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1996. West Haven, CT; Northeast Program
        Evaluation Center, 1997.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Second Progress Report on the
        Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1998.
        West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 1999.

Seibyl, C.L., Rosenheck, R., Corwel, L. and Medak, S. Third Progress Report on the
        Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) / Veterans Industries (VI) Fiscal Year 1999.
        West Haven, CT; Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2000.

Seibyl, C.L., Sieffert, D., Medak, S. and Rosenheck, R. Fifth Progress Report on the
        Compensated Work Therapy / Transitional Residence Program. West Haven, CT;
        Northeast Program Evaluation Center, 2002.

APPENDICES

Contents of the Appendices:

Appendix A. Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version)

Appendix B. CWT/VI Monitoring Data Tables

Appendix C. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables

Appendix A
Veterans Industries Monitoring Data Sheet (Third Version)

For office use only

FORM __VI__   **(2)**

COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT ADMISSION

Staff Member's Name _____

Admission Date to VI (mm,dd,yy) . . . . ☐☐/☐☐/☐☐   **(8)**

VA Facility Name _____ VA Facility Code . . . . ☐☐☐   **(11)**

Two-character alphanumeric station code suffix (if applicable) . . . . ☐☐   **(13)**

VI (or CWT) Subdivision Code (do not use unless you have registered a subdivision and have received a formal subdivision code from NEPEC). . . . . ☐   **(14)**

PART I INTERVIEW (to be administered to veteran by a clinician)

A. VETERAN DESCRIPTION

1. Veteran's Name (last name, first initial)   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐   **(34)**

2. Social Security Number. . . . . ☐☐☐-☐☐-☐☐☐☐   **(43)**

3. Date of Birth (mm,dd,yy) . . . . ☐☐/☐☐/☐☐   **(49)**

4. Sex   **(50)**

> ☐ 1. Male   ☐ 2. Female

5. Ethnicity (check only one)   **(51)**

> ☐ 1. Hispanic, white   ☐ 4. Black, not Hispanic   ☐ 6. White
> ☐ 2. Hispanic, black   ☐ 5. Asian   ☐ 7. Other
> ☐ 3. American Indian or Alaskan

6. Marital status (check only one)   **(52)**

> ☐ 1. married   ☐ 3. widowed   ☐ 5. divorced
> ☐ 2. remarried   ☐ 4. separated   ☐ 6. never married

53–56 BLANK

9. Have you ever worked in VI (or CWT) before this admission? . . . . ☐ 0 = No ☐ 1 = Yes   **(57)**

10. What was the highest level you completed in school **(e.g. GED = 12; 1 yr of college = 13)**?   ☐☐   **(59)**

11. How many months of training or technical education have you completed (exclude training in the military)? . . . . (mos) ☐☐   **(61)**

B. EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME HISTORY

12. In your lifetime, what was the year you had your greatest employment earnings? . . . . (year) 19/20 ☐☐   **(63)**

13. Approximately, how much were your employment earnings in that year ($/year)? (dollar amount only — no cents) . . . . $ ☐☐☐,☐☐☐   **(69)**

70–75 BLANK

16. What has been your **usual** employment pattern during the **past three years**? (check only one)   **(76)**

> ☐ 1. Full time (regular; ≥ 35 hrs/wk)   ☐ 5. Service/Volunteer
> ☐ 2. Regular part time (< 35 hrs/wk)   ☐ 6. Retired/disabled
> ☐ 3. Irregular part time (day jobs)   ☐ 7. Unemployed
> ☐ 4. Student/training program   ☐ 8. Other

17. What year was the last time you held a job in the community for a month or more? . . . . . . (year) 19/20 ☐☐   **(78)**

79–82 BLANK

19. In the last 30 days, how many days did you work for pay? (exclude VI and IT) . . . . (days) ☐☐   **(84)**

20. In the last 30 days, how much money did you receive from employment? (exclude VI and IT) (dollar amount only — no cents) . . . . $ ☐☐☐☐   **(88)**

Veterans Inustries

Monitoring Data Sheet

(Third Version–Revised 9/2000)
Page 2 of 5

21. Do you currently receive any of the following kinds of financial support?
    (check one box for each question)
    1. Service Connected Psychiatry (include 0%)....................... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(89)**
    2. Service Connected Other (include 0%) .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
    3. NSC Pension .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
    4. SSDI (Social Security Disability Insurance) .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
    5. SSI (Supplemental Security Income) .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
    6. Social Security Retirement .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
    7. Other disability (e.g. workmen's compensation)................... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
    8. Other public support (e.g. food stamps, general relief) .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(96)**

22. In the past 30 days, how much money did you receive from these sources (dollar amount —
    no cents) (code 0000 if veteran does not receive financial support from any of the above)? . $ ☐☐☐☐ **(100)**

C. MILITARY HISTORY

23. Period of Service (check **longest** one)   **(101)**
    - ❑ 1. Pre-WWII (11/18–11/41)
    - ❑ 2. World War II (12/41–12/46)
    - ❑ 3. Pre-Korean War (1/47–6/50)
    - ❑ 4. Korean War (7/50–1/55)
    - ❑ 5. Between Korean and Vietnam Eras (2/55–7/64)
    - ❑ 6. Vietnam Era (8/64–4/75)
    - ❑ 7. Post-Vietnam Era (5/75–7/90)
    - ❑ 8. Persian Gulf (8/90–   )
    - ❑ 9. Post-Persian Gulf

24. Did you ever receive hostile or friendly fire in combat zone? .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(102)**

D. LIVING SITUATION

25. Where did you usually sleep during the month before you were admitted to the VI (or CWT) program? (select one)   **(103)**
    - ❑ 1. own apartment, room or house (include boarding home)
    - ❑ 2. someone else's apartment, room or house
    - ❑ 3. hospital or nursing home
    - ❑ 4. domiciliary
    - ❑ 5. halfway house, transitional living facility
    - ❑ 6. hotel, Single Room Occupancy (SRO)
    - ❑ 7. shelter for the homeless
    - ❑ 8. outdoors, abandoned building, car
    - ❑ 9. other (specify _____)

    DO NOT CODE ☐☐ **(105)**

26. On the last date you were living in the community (e.g. not in a hospital or a health care
    type institution) were you homeless **(lacking a fixed, regular and adequate night-time
    residence)** .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(106)**

107–109 BLANK

    26b. How long was that episode of homelessness (select one)?
    **[Note: Length of time homeless is determined by figuring the number of months or
    years since the veteran last had a fixed, regular and adequate night-time residence,
    minus the time spent in any institution (hospital, halfway house, jail etc.)]**   **(110)**
    - ❑ 1. less than 1 month
    - ❑ 2. at least 1 month but less than 6 months
    - ❑ 3. at least 6 months but less than 1 year
    - ❑ 4. at least 1 year but less than 2 years
    - ❑ 5. two years or more
    - ❑ 9. unknown

111–112 BLANK

E. HEALTH STATUS

29. Have you **ever** been hospitalized for: (check one box for each question)
    1. treatment of alcoholism? .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(113)**
    2. treatment of drug problems? .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes
    3. a psychiatric problem (include PTSD)? .... ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes **(115)**

116 BLANK

For office use only

31. Which of the following health problems do you currently have: (check one box for each question)

    1. medical problem? . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(117)**

    2. problem with alcohol? . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    3. problem with drugs? . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    4. psychiatric or emotional problem? . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

32. Have you ever lost a job because of alcohol and/or drug problems? . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(121)**

F.   LEGAL HISTORY

33. Have you ever been arrested? (check one)   **(122)**

    ❑ 0. no   ❑ 2. yes, 2–5 times   ❑ 4. yes, more than 10 times

    ❑ 1. yes, once   ❑ 3. yes, 6–10 times

34. Have you ever been incarcerated (i.e. been in jail or prison) in your life? (check one)   **(123)**

    ❑ 0. no   ❑ 1. yes, less than two weeks   ❑ 2. yes, two weeks or more

PART II CLINICIAN'S OBSERVATIONS AND IMPRESSIONS
(to be completed by a clinician)

35. How was contact with the VI (or CWT) Program initiated? (select one)   **(124)**

    ❑ 1. referral from VA inpatient unit   ❑ 4. referral from a non-VA health

    ❑ 2. referral from a VA outpatient program   care provider/agency

       (specify outpt program type _____)   ❑ 5. self-referred

    ❑ 3. referral from a VA domiciliary   ❑ 6. Vet Center referral

                     ❑ 7. other (specify _____)

                            DO NOT CODE   □□   **(126)**

36. Is the veteran currently in a VA domiciliary or inpatient unit? . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(127)**

128–141 BLANK

40. Please indicate below the veteran's DSM-III-R diagnosis as determined by professionals
in this program or from the medical record.   (check one box for each question)

    1. PTSD . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(142)**

    2. Anxiety Disorder (other than PTSD) . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    3. Affective Disorder (other than Bipolar Disorder) . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    4. Bipolar Disorder . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(145)**

    5. Schizophrenia . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    6. Psychosis (other than schizophrenia) . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    7. Adjustment Disorder . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(148)**

    8. Alcohol Abuse/Dependence . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    9. Drug Abuse/Dependence . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    10. Personality Disorder . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    11. Other (specify _____) ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(152)**

41. Please indicate below any disabling medical conditions that apply to this veteran as
determined by professionals in this program or from the medical record.   (check one box
for each question)

    1. Head Injury . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(153)**

    2. Cerebro-Vascular Accident (e.g. Stroke) . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    3. Spinal Cord Injury (Paraplegia/Quadriplegia) . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    4. Arthritis . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    5. Multiple Sclerosis . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(157)**

    6. Liver Disease (e.g. Cirrhosis) . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    7. Pulmonary Disease (e.g. COPD) . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    8. Dementia . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    9. Orthopedic Problems (e.g. Back Injuries) . . . . ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes

    10. Other (specify _____) ❑ 0 = No ❑ 1 = Yes   **(162)**

                           DO NOT CODE   □□   **(164)**

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────┐
│ COMPLETE THIS SECTION AT DISCHARGE       │
└─────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

**165–170
BLANK**

Staff Member's Name _____

Last date worked in VI (or CWT) (mm,dd,yy) . . . . ▢▢/▢▢/▢▢ **(176)**

I. PARTICIPATION IN VETERANS INDUSTRIES

1. Hours worked in VI (or CWT):

   1. Total hours worked . . . . (hrs) ▢▢▢,▢▢▢ **(182)**

   **183–185
   BLANK**

2. Earnings in VI (or CWT):

   1. Total gross earnings (dollar amount — no cents) . . . . $ ▢▢,▢▢▢ **(190)**

   **191–194
   BLANK**

3. While in VI (or CWT), did the veteran spend any time in the following job locations?
   (check one box for each question)

   1. Workshop on VA grounds . . . . ▢ 0 = No ▢ 1 = Yes **(195)**

   2. Supported employment (transitional work experience) on VA grounds . . . . ▢ 0 = No ▢ 1 = Yes

   3. Workshop in the community . . . . ▢ 0 = No ▢ 1 = Yes

   4. Supported employment (transitional work experience) in the community . . . . ▢ 0 = No ▢ 1 = Yes **(198)**

4. Consider the following work performance and clinical areas and select the description that best
   reflects changes that occurred during the veteran's VI (or CWT) admission (check one box for each question).

	9. not applicable	0. deteriorated	1. unchanged	2. improved	
A. Work Performance Areas					
1. Personal hygiene/appearance	▢	▢	▢	▢	**(199)**
2. Attendance and punctuality	▢	▢	▢	▢	
3. Acceptance of supervision	▢	▢	▢	▢	
4. Ability to get along with co-workers	▢	▢	▢	▢	
5. Productivity (output volume)	▢	▢	▢	▢	
6. Quality of production	▢	▢	▢	▢	**(204)**
B. Clinical Areas					
7. Alcohol problems	▢	▢	▢	▢	**(205)**
8. Drug problems	▢	▢	▢	▢	
9. Mental health problems other than substance abuse .	▢	▢	▢	▢	
10. Medical problems	▢	▢	▢	▢	**(208)**

5. In your opinion, is this veteran ready for working in full-time competitive employment?. . . . . ▢ 0 = No ▢ 1 = Yes **(209)**

For office use only

II. DISCHARGE STATUS

6. The veteran's mode of discharge was: (check only one)   **(210)**
    - ☐ 1. Mutually agreed upon planned discharge
    - ☐ 2. Involuntary discharge because of failure to comply with program requirements
      (specify _____)
    - ☐ 3. Veteran left the program before planned discharge date and informed staff of his/her departure
    - ☐ 4. Veteran left the program before planned discharge date and **did not** inform staff (AWOL)
    - ☐ 5. Veteran became ill (physically or mentally) and was not able to work in VI (or CWT)
    - ☐ 6. Other (specify _____)

                                                    DO NOT CODE   ☐☐   **(212)**

7. Veteran's employment situation after discharge from VI (or CWT) will be: (check only one)   **(213)**

    - ☐ 1. Full-time paid competitive employment   ☐ 6. Unemployed
      in the community   ☐ 7. Retired/disabled/too ill
    - ☐ 2. Part-time paid competitive employment   ☐ 8. Veteran left program without giving
      in the community   indication of his/her employment situation
    - ☐ 3. VA's Incentive Therapy (IT)   ☐ 9. Other (specify _____)
    - ☐ 4. Student/trainee
    - ☐ 5. Unpaid volunteer

                                                    DO NOT CODE   ☐☐   **(215)**

216–221 BLANK

10. Veteran's housing situation after discharge from VI (or CWT) will be: (check only one)   **(222)**
    - ☐ 1. Institution (e.g. hospital, nursing home, domicilary)   ☐ 5. No available residence other than
    - ☐ 2. Halfway house/transitional living program   homeless shelters, outdoors etc.
    - ☐ 3. Own apartment, room or house   ☐ 6. Veteran left program without giving
      (include boarding home)   indication of his/her housing situation
    - ☐ 4. Apartment, room or house of friend   ☐ 7. Other (specify _____)
      or family member

                                                    DO NOT CODE   ☐☐   **(224)**

III. ARRANGEMENTS FOR POST DISCHARGE AFTERCARE

11. If the veteran has arrangements to work in competitive employment after discharge,
     are there plans for VI (or CWT) staff to provide any of the following types of support?
     (check one box for each question)

	0. no	3. yes, weekly	2. yes, monthly	1. yes, less often than monthly	
a. office-based vocational counseling	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(225)**
b. on-the-job support	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(226)**
c. telephone support	☐	☐	☐	☐	**(227)**

Appendix B
CWT/VI Monitoring Data Tables

Table 1. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year.

VISN		SITE	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY93-FY01
1	405	**White River Junction, VT**					7	10	1	0	2	20
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	64	385	477	504	535	487	481	348	344	3625
1	523	**Boston, MA**		15	4	0	0	0	0	30	51	100
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	2	56	124	73	80	154	126	65	86	766
1	608	**Manchester, NH**			21	18	22	10				71
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	3	35	72	143	123	144	214	231	175	1140
1	650	**Providence, RI**	2	7	24	49	65	59	36	33	35	310
1	689	**West Haven, CT**		37	69	60	92	69	39	92	73	531
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**		2	41	58	72	77	70	43	54	417
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	4	24	11	26	1	46	77	38	24	251
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**		17	23	31	46	17	39	67	109	349
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	4	25	32	51	40	47	43	64	64	370
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	11	40	23	69	35	62	43	120	113	516
3	526	**Bronx, NY**				11	50	67	77	94	115	414
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**			5	26	166	203	221	159	21	801
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	20	109	94	226	121	57	0†	3	131	761
3	620	**Montrose, NY**			2	37	108	201	182	174	142	846
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**				6	55	62	45	49	66	283
3	632	**Northport, NY**	2	7	30	66	117	155	81	27	82	567
4	529	**Butler, PA**				8	6	24	49	49	45	181
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	43	211	194	282	229	252	289	265	261	2026
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**		50	85	96	90	105	102	100	94	722
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**		1	2	3	29	14	67	46	23	185
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	9	58	105	157	172	210	153	168	170	1202
4	693	**Wilkes-Barre, PA**									2	2
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**				8	58	41	27	21	12	167
5	512A4	**Ft. Howard, MD**			1	5	10	10	25	15	0	66
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	5	0	10	26	24	23	33	13	41	175
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**					26	0	217	205	222	670
5	688	**Washington, DC**	4	16	58	52	57	75	40	93	82	477
6	558	**Durham, NC**	0	4	17	19	22	18	19	12	10	121
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	20	124	116	118	113	124	72	75	86	848
6	637	**Asheville, NC**		1	6	4	0	0	9	17	24	61
6	652	**Richmond, VA**		6	71	41	42	24	31	2	2	219
6	658	**Salem, VA**	4	29	34	27	52	25	68	42	38	319
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**		13	228	170	112	139	179	307	195	1343
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	4	19	11	30	44	54	60	31	50	303
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**						2	59	67	54	182
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	5	20	51	47	36	52	64	59	80	414
7	544	**Columbia, SC**									1	1
7	557	**Dublin, GA**							4	15	0	19
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**									21	21
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	17	86	69	72	61	88	82	76	72	623
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	2	20	67	71	73	133	165	165	135	831
8	546	**Miami, FL**			15	20	20	30	44	56	39	224
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**							19	25	35	79
8	573	**Gainesville, FL**			2	9	42	79	85	75	62	354
8	573A4	**Lake City, FL**				1	1	14	0	0	0	16
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	1	43	64	66	59	57	87	120	78	575
9	596	**Lexington, KY**	22	104	101	87	74	62	50	51		551
9	614	**Memphis, TN**			1	4	32	25	33	39	37	171
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	5	2	104	88	127	143	139	106	126	840
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	15	82	106	101	122	126	146	156	130	984
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	11	116	4	54	87	92	68	85	121	638
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**									149	149
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	5	85	124	109	120	154	132	145	164	1038
10	552	**Dayton, OH**			1	11	13	9	41	21	9	105

Table 1. CWT/VI Discharges Documented by Monitoring Data by Site and by Fiscal Year.

VISN	SITE		FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY93-FY01
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI						5	6	3	0	14
11	515	Battle Creek, MI		18	78	127	101	83	86	61	57	611
11	550	Danville, IL	9	13	25	69	1	0	34	34	50	235
11	583	Indianapolis, IN					16	46	45	39	31	177
12	556	North Chicago, IL	16	69	55	76	0	0	111	211	205	743
12	578	Hines, IL		51	52	97	121	140	128	160	180	929
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI									7	7
12	676	Tomah, WI		17	48	65	51	33	53	50	77	394
12	695	Milwaukee, WI		17	72	55	53	66	86	82	66	497
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD									15	15
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	3	37	88	82	91	66	58	54	51	530
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	15	70	96	86	98	66	83	75	83	672
13	618	Minneapolis, MN								15	12	27
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	10	62	109	172	178	223	221	181	100	1256
14	636A6	Des Moines, IA						4	18	27	7	56
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	3	29	52	103	44	92	71	45	18	457
15	543	Columbia, MO			6	9	12	0	15	5	4	51
15	589	Kansas City, MO	4	96	189	159	105	118	129	110	0	910
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO				9	11	11	5	6	1	43
15	677	Topeka, KS	1	55	35	84	64	38	26	7	23	333
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	3	5	8	2	1	9	46	62	62	198
16	520	Biloxi, MS		6	16	54	114	112	122	159	129	712
16	580	Houston, TX	2	20	52	81	113	87	114	132	135	736
16	586	Jackson, MS				1	11	21	25	44	50	152
16	598	Little Rock, AR		26	4	22	169	186	205	250	260	1122
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK		22	32	29	81	48	16	51	46	325
17	549	Dallas, TX	43	152	231	293	344	278	286	327	346	2300
17	549A4	Bonham, TX			17	2	36	39	83	65	65	307
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX									70	70
17	671	San Antonio, TX			6	18	28	30	19	25	23	149
17	674	Temple, TX		9	19	46	82	45	33	39	23	296
17	674A4	Waco, TX	13	61	76	13	5	41	0	2	23	234
18	501	Albuquerque, NM								2	17	19
18	644	Phoenix, AZ					15	56	21	23	52	167
18	649	Prescott, AZ	7	14	28	29	76	72	87	86	122	521
18	678	Tucson, AZ			16	41	51	67	51	62	52	340
18	756	El Paso, TX					2	2	4	2	3	13
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	1	14	29	16	24	23	18	23	29	177
19	666	Sheridan, WY						12	11	11	4	38
20	463	Anchorage, AK		14	17	45	75	40	21	24	34	270
20	648	Portland, OR			21	34	19	29	45	80	88	316
20	653	Roseburg, OR		9	18	15	22	14	30	32	41	181
20	663	Seattle, WA			5	12	22	14	3	6		62
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	5	29	139	89	113	69	68	56	35	603
20	692	White City, OR	3	44	44	115	147	147	168	87	84	839
21	459	Honolulu, HI		2	6	8	8	9	9	18	10	70
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	45	191	59	1	10	52	36	42	47	483
21	654	Reno, NV		1	3	5	1	12	9	12	12	55
21	662	San Francisco, CA	8	49	62	86	79	98	88	44	96	610
22	600	Long Beach, CA		6	4	46	35	59	60	55	23	288
22	605	Loma Linda, CA		3	44	76	69	73	84	78	89	516
22	664	San Diego, CA					3	10	21	23	24	81
22	691	West LA, CA				10	22	0	22	46	5	105
22	691A4	Sepulveda, CA	10	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
TOTAL			**485**	**3,080**	**4,561**	**5,622**	**6,411**	**6,876**	**7,413**	**7,492**	**7,443**	**49,383**
SITE AVERAGE			**11**	**45**	**55**	**62**	**66**	**68**	**73**	**72**	**68**	**441**
SITE S.D.			**13**	**60**	**69**	**74**	**74**	**74**	**75**	**73**	**69**	**503**

28

Table 2. Sociodemographic, Military Service History and Referral Source by Fiscal Year

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3080	FY95 n=4561	FY96 n=5622	FY97 n=6411	FY98 n=6876	FY99 n=7413	FY00 n=7492	FY01 n=7443
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC									
Age (mean years)	43.1	43.0	43.1	43.8	44.4	44.9	45.4	46.0	46.5
Female	3.1%	3.2%	3.4%	4.1%	4.0%	4.5%	4.5%	4.3%	4.2%
Ethnicity									
White	57.1%	55.1%	50.2%	49.5%	50.4%	49.2%	47.0%	44.5%	45.7%
African American	36.0%	39.1%	43.7%	43.2%	41.7%	43.3%	45.9%	48.3%	46.8%
Hispanic	4.4%	3.5%	2.4%	3.6%	4.4%	4.4%	4.8%	4.6%	4.5%
Other	2.5%	2.3%	3.7%	3.7%	3.5%	3.1%	2.3%	2.6%	3.0%
Marital status									
married	1.7%	9.6%	9.1%	9.3%	9.2%	8.9%	7.8%	7.5%	7.9%
separated/widowed/divorced	58.8%	61.1%	62.1%	61.0%	61.7%	63.1%	63.2%	63.3%	63.7%
never married	31.6%	29.3%	28.9%	29.7%	29.1%	28.1%	29.0%	29.2%	28.4%
Education									
< 12 years	14.2%	12.1%	10.2%	10.0%	11.4%	10.1%	9.8%	8.8%	7.6%
12 years	47.4%	50.5%	50.8%	49.9%	49.5%	49.5%	49.6%	50.0%	50.7%
> 12 years	38.4%	37.5%	39.1%	40.1%	39.1%	40.5%	40.6%	41.3%	41.7%
MILITARY SERVICE HISTORY									
Service Era									
Persian Gulf era	1.7%	2.3%	2.7%	3.1%	3.0%	4.0%	4.4%	4.5%	5.1%
Post-Vietnam era	26.5%	29.7%	32.5%	34.4%	35.0%	35.7%	37.7%	40.2%	40.9%
Vietnam era	56.5%	54.8%	53.7%	51.9%	52.9%	52.3%	50.8%	48.9%	48.8%
Between Korean and Vietnam eras	8.1%	8.8%	7.7%	7.7%	6.7%	6.3%	5.8%	5.2%	4.3%
Korean era	4.1%	2.9%	2.2%	2.0%	1.9%	1.3%	0.9%	1.0%	0.7%
All other service eras	3.1%	1.5%	1.2%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%
HOW CONTACT WAS INITIATED									
Referral Source									
VA inpatient unit	33.5%	32.6%	27.6%	24.7%	17.9%	13.9%	13.3%	11.6%	11.0%
VA outpatient program	25.5%	25.4%	27.5%	30.8%	36.1%	38.5%	38.2%	40.5%	40.0%
VA domiciliary	26.2%	26.1%	26.6%	28.5%	31.0%	33.1%	34.5%	32.3%	34.0%
Non-VA health care provider or agency	1.3%	2.7%	2.3%	1.8%	1.7%	2.2%	2.7%	3.5%	3.8%
Self-referred	4.6%	6.9%	10.1%	9.7%	8.4%	7.6%	7.4%	7.8%	7.7%
Vet Center	2.1%	1.1%	1.5%	1.1%	1.4%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	0.8%
Other	6.9%	5.2%	4.4%	3.4%	3.6%	3.8%	3.2%	3.3%	2.7%

Table 3. Employment, Benefit, Income and Residential Histories by Fiscal Year.

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3080	FY95 n=4561	FY96 n=5622	FY97 n=6411	FY98 n=6876	FY99 n=7413	FY00 n=7492	FY01 n=7443
EMPLOYMENT HISTORY									
Worked previously in CWT	33.1%	27.6%	24.1%	26.8%	26.1%	27.7%	27.7%	29.5%	31.0%
Usual employment pattern past 3 years									
Competitively employed full-time	31.1%	36.1%	37.6%	38.7%	40.1%	40.6%	42.4%	43.3%	44.3%
Competitively emp regular part-time	7.1%	7.3%	9.6%	8.7%	8.4%	7.9%	8.5%	8.4%	8.4%
Competitively emp irregular part-time	21.7%	20.5%	20.7%	19.3%	19.5%	20.6%	20.7%	20.4%	21.0%
Student/trainee	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%
Unpaid volunteer	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%
Retired/disabled	10.5%	9.7%	7.8%	8.2%	7.9%	7.2%	6.0%	6.9%	6.4%
Unemployed	26.2%	23.0%	21.1%	21.2%	20.8%	20.2%	18.6%	17.6%	16.0%
Other	2.2%	2.2%	2.0%	2.5%	2.1%	2.4%	2.6%	2.5%	3.1%
Usually employed or involved in constructive activity past 3 years	61.2%	65.1%	69.0%	68.0%	69.2%	70.2%	72.8%	73.0%	74.5%
Days worked for pay past 30 days									
none	87.5%	89.5%	88.8%	88.1%	88.2%	88.2%	88.8%	89.6%	90.6%
1-19 days	8.6%	7.4%	7.4%	8.4%	8.6%	8.0%	8.1%	8.2%	6.8%
> 19 days	4.0%	3.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.2%	3.8%	3.1%	2.2%	2.6%
Mean # of days worked for pay past 30	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.1
Ever lost a job due to substance abuse	47.6%	52.9%	55.0%	55.4%	55.9%	55.9%	57.7%	58.5%	58.4%
BENEFIT HISTORY									
Benefits currently receiving									
SC psychiatry	10.2%	9.5%	6.7%	6.3%	6.1%	5.4%	5.3%	5.0%	4.8%
SC medical	14.9%	12.4%	11.8%	13.4%	13.4%	12.4%	12.9%	13.5%	12.2%
NSC pension	2.9%	3.9%	3.4%	3.6%	3.6%	3.0%	3.2%	4.8%	4.6%
Receives any VA benefits	25.6%	23.2%	20.3%	21.5%	21.3%	19.1%	19.8%	21.7%	20.0%
Social Security benefits (SSI, SSDI)	22.3%	16.1%	13.1%	15.2%	12.7%	9.1%	9.4%	9.4%	8.8%
Any disability (VA and/or SS)	38.1%	31.9%	27.4%	30.3%	28.2%	24.3%	24.8%	25.2%	23.6%
INCOME HISTORY									
Mean employment income past 30 days	$51.68	$35.64	$46.36	$45.41	$42.02	$46.77	$45.69	$40.48	$39.17
Mean public support income past 30 days	$302.76	$238.01	$206.57	$231.19	$214.00	$196.64	$193.97	$190.91	$175.97
Total income received past 30 days	$346.80	$270.80	$250.34	$271.02	$247.89	$235.87	$232.38	$227.76	$214.89
RESIDENTIAL HISTORY									
Usual residence past 30 days									
Own apartment, room or house	26.1%	23.4%	20.4%	21.5%	20.8%	18.6%	17.5%	16.9%	17.4%
Apartment, room or house of family or friend	18.5%	15.8%	16.6%	15.6%	13.3%	14.8%	13.6%	14.8%	14.4%
Hospital or nursing home	11.0%	13.1%	13.4%	12.3%	10.7%	9.3%	9.8%	8.6%	6.8%
Domiciliary	19.7%	21.1%	22.4%	23.8%	26.8%	27.5%	27.8%	24.8%	27.5%
Halfway house, transitional living program	5.6%	7.3%	8.3%	9.4%	10.6%	12.0%	14.1%	16.8%	14.3%
Hotel or SRO	3.1%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%
Shelter	10.8%	12.6%	13.2%	11.6%	12.6%	12.5%	12.0%	12.2%	13.1%
Outdoors, abandoned building etc.	3.9%	4.0%	3.8%	3.9%	3.5%	3.1%	3.3%	3.7%	3.6%
Other	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%
Homeless when last living in community	53.5%	56.9%	59.9%	58.3%	57.9%	59.0%	61.7%	60.8%	60.6%
Currently in Domiciliary or Inpatient Unit	55.3%	49.7%	40.5%	40.1%	38.3%	38.5%	39.3%	37.8%	40.7%

Table 4. Health Status and Hospitalization History by Fiscal Year.

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3080	FY95 n=4561	FY96 n=5622	FY97 n=6411	FY98 n=6876	FY99 n=7413	FY00 n=7492	FY01 n=7443
CLINICAL ASSESSMENTS									
Psychiatric Diagnoses									
Alcohol abuse/dependency	62.7%	69.3%	72.2%	72.2%	73.6%	74.7%	74.3%	74.7%	75.4%
Drug abuse/dependency	43.7%	50.6%	54.4%	55.2%	55.5%	57.7%	59.7%	61.6%	60.4%
Any substance abuse/dependency	72.6%	78.8%	82.3%	82.5%	84.3%	85.7%	85.5%	86.5%	86.9%
Serious mental illness†	46.5%	43.3%	40.8%	43.1%	43.0%	43.3%	45.7%	45.1%	35.8%
Dual diagnosis††	25.7%	29.5%	29.3%	31.1%	32.6%	34.2%	36.4%	36.3%	28.4%
Any psychiatric disorder	94.8%	95.4%	95.7%	96.4%	96.5%	96.7%	96.9%	97.1%	96.5%
Any disabling medical condition	42.8%	44.8%	46.1%	45.2%	44.2%	45.6%	47.2%	48.7%	51.1%
Any psychiatric disorder or disabling medical condition	98.8%	98.6%	98.9%	99.2%	99.2%	99.5%	99.6%	99.6%	99.7%
HOSPITALIZATION HISTORY									
Ever hospitalized for alcohol problems	64.3%	70.4%	71.7%	71.2%	70.3%	70.8%	70.0%	69.2%	68.3%
Ever hospitalized for drug problems	42.5%	51.1%	53.9%	54.3%	52.8%	53.4%	55.4%	56.3%	54.2%
Ever hospitalized for psychiatric problems	50.8%	49.2%	43.3%	44.9%	42.9%	41.9%	43.0%	42.4%	41.1%
Ever hospitalized for any mental health problem	88.8%	91.6%	90.5%	89.6%	88.8%	87.8%	87.4%	86.7%	85.4%

† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories:

schizophrenia, psychotic disorder (other than schizophrenia), mood disorder and PTSD.

†† Dual Diagnosis is defined as having both a substance abuse disorder and a serious psychiatric

Table 5. Program Participation by Fiscal Year.

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3080	FY95 n=4561	FY96 n=5622	FY97 n=6411	FY98 n=6876	FY99 n=7413	FY00 n=7492	FY01 n=7443
MODE OF DISCHARGE									
Mutually agreed upon/planned discharge	41.9%	41.4%	39.1%	43.1%	44.6%	46.9%	51.2%	51.3%	51.4%
Failure to comply with program requirements	9.2%	12.7%	14.0%	15.6%	16.0%	17.0%	16.1%	15.3%	17.3%
Left before planned discharge (informed staff)	14.5%	14.0%	14.0%	12.1%	14.2%	13.9%	11.7%	12.3%	11.5%
Left before planned discharge (did not inform staff)	23.8%	24.9%	26.7%	21.6%	19.1%	16.7%	15.9%	15.0%	14.4%
Veteran became to ill to participate	9.4%	5.6%	4.7%	5.5%	4.7%	4.4%	4.0%	4.2%	4.0%
Other	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	2.2%	1.4%	1.1%	1.2%	1.9%	1.3%
HOURS AND EARNINGS IN CWT/VI									
Total mean hours worked in CWT/VI	77.0	224.2	374.7	461.9	510.8	515.6	556.9	538.0	489.6
Total mean earnings in CWT/VI	$307.93	$1,025.07	$1,835.94	$2,276.98	$2,573.43	$2,819.27	$3,235.00	$3,105.20	$2,872.45
Average hourly wage in CWT/VI	$3.72	$4.17	$4.58	$4.44	$4.84	$5.29	$5.51	$5.59	$5.72
Average hours worked weekly in CWT/VI	20.3	22.3	24.8	26.0	25.2	25.4	25.5	26.1	25.9
Average weekly earnings in CWT/VI	$83.28	$99.02	$118.95	$113.51	$131.14	$142.29	$146.63	$155.56	$154.81
LOCATION OF CWT PARTICIPATION									
VA and/or community workshop only	67.2%	55.8%	40.4%	36.2%	29.7%	24.5%	19.0%	20.3%	20.4%
VA and/or community supported employment or transitional work experience only	14.2%	21.1%	31.3%	32.0%	41.3%	48.1%	57.2%	58.2%	61.7%
Veteran had any workshop placement	84.1%	78.1%	68.0%	66.8%	58.2%	51.4%	42.3%	41.2%	37.4%
Veteran had any supported employment or transitional work experience placement	30.1%	43.3%	58.8%	62.6%	69.7%	75.2%	80.5%	79.2%	78.2%

Table 6. Discharge Status and Improvement Noted in Clinical and Work Performance Areas Among Veterans with a Problem in the Area by Fiscal Year.

VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	FY93 n=485	FY94 n=3080	FY95 n=4561	FY96 n=5622	FY97 n=6411	FY98 n=6876	FY99 n=7413	FY00 n=7492	FY01 n=7443
IMPROVEMENT IN WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS†									
Personal hygiene/appearance	18.8%	23.9%	29.0%	34.3%	45.8%	55.9%	62.1%	66.2%	67.6%
Attendance and punctuality	22.0%	27.2%	31.5%	36.7%	48.4%	56.2%	61.0%	61.2%	64.1%
Acceptance of Supervision	23.7%	31.4%	34.6%	39.8%	49.6%	58.3%	62.9%	64.2%	66.8%
Relationship with co-workers	23.3%	32.9%	35.0%	40.1%	50.1%	57.6%	62.9%	64.7%	66.9%
Productivity	40.4%	41.7%	39.2%	44.6%	55.1%	62.1%	64.8%	66.4%	67.5%
Quality of production	35.4%	40.2%	38.9%	43.9%	54.0%	61.2%	64.9%	66.5%	68.2%
Average work improvement score††	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.29	1.41	1.50	1.55	1.57	1.60
VETERAN IS READY FOR COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT	38.4%	42.7%	42.9%	45.9%	51.4%	54.8%	59.8%	60.2%	59.9%
IMPROVEMENT IN CLINICAL AREAS†									
Alcohol problems	26.3%	28.6%	31.8%	34.3%	45.5%	55.3%	61.2%	63.4%	64.1%
Drug problems	19.4%	25.0%	26.4%	31.0%	42.5%	53.8%	59.9%	62.8%	62.7%
Mental health problems	21.4%	22.1%	20.0%	22.7%	32.8%	41.2%	45.5%	47.1%	49.2%
Medical problems	10.6%	12.1%	14.2%	12.9%	23.8%	31.1%	34.9%	35.2%	40.0%
ARRANGEMENTS FOR EMPLOYMENT AT DISCHARGE									
Competitively employed full-time	15.5%	17.1%	22.5%	24.3%	28.5%	32.4%	34.0%	36.5%	37.5%
Competitively employed part-time	5.8%	3.8%	2.9%	4.0%	4.6%	4.7%	4.9%	4.8%	3.9%
Incentive Therapy (IT)	2.1%	2.3%	2.8%	1.7%	1.4%	1.3%	1.5%	1.5%	1.2%
Student/trainee	2.9%	3.1%	2.6%	3.3%	3.2%	2.5%	3.1%	3.2%	2.8%
Unpaid volunteer	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%
Unemployed	20.3%	26.1%	27.8%	29.2%	29.5%	27.7%	27.6%	24.6%	25.9%
Retired/disabled	16.4%	13.6%	8.9%	10.9%	10.7%	10.2%	9.4%	10.5%	10.9%
Unknown	30.2%	28.1%	28.1%	23.3%	19.3%	18.8%	15.8%	14.8%	14.4%
Other	6.6%	5.8%	4.0%	3.0%	2.4%	2.0%	3.4%	3.9%	3.3%
ARRANGEMENTS FOR HOUSING AT DISCHARGE									
Hospital, nursing home or domiciliary	26.8%	21.6%	16.3%	14.4%	13.4%	13.9%	13.2%	13.5%	13.2%
Halfway house/transitional living program	3.5%	5.0%	4.6%	6.7%	7.2%	8.5%	9.3%	10.8%	11.6%
Own apartment, room or house	23.5%	27.6%	29.5%	34.9%	37.2%	36.4%	38.8%	35.4%	33.7%
Apartment, room, house of family/friend	11.5%	12.0%	14.8%	13.5%	15.8%	16.8%	15.8%	16.8%	17.2%
No available residence/homeless	3.7%	2.8%	4.8%	5.9%	5.4%	4.7%	4.7%	5.2%	6.2%
Unknown	30.2%	29.9%	28.6%	23.1%	20.0%	18.6%	16.9%	16.8%	16.4%
Other	0.9%	1.2%	1.5%	1.6%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.7%

† Improvement is noted only among those veterans who have a problem in that area.

†† Average Work Improvement score is the mean of five work performance areas where the range 0-2 (0 = deteriorated, 1 = unchanged and 2 = improved).

Table 7. Program Participation by VISN for FY01.

	VISN †, ††		VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION			
			Serious Mental Illness †††	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements	Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week	Average Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI
VISN	#SITES	N	%	%	%	%	%
1	7	766	53.1%	46.9%	15.9%	19.6	$6.61
2	5	364	42.0%	62.4%	16.2%	30.6	$5.20
3	6	557	34.9%	50.4%	18.5%	29.0	$5.53
4	6	595	24.9%	61.3%	16.3%	29.3	$5.38
5	4	357	38.7%	55.5%	15.1%	29.8	$5.41
6	5	160	30.6%	62.5%	17.5%	29.9	$5.23
7	7	473	36.4%	46.3%	22.2%	28.9	$5.56
8	5	349	28.9%	53.3%	12.6%	30.7	$5.38
9	3	293	24.9%	33.8%	23.2%	29.2	$5.45
10	4	443	33.6%	70.4%	15.6%	16.7	$6.03
11	3	138	42.0%	39.1%	21.0%	30.0	$6.17
12	5	535	37.4%	52.9%	20.6%	20.5	$6.17
13	5	261	37.9%	47.5%	11.5%	25.4	$5.08
14	2	25	60.0%	76.0%	4.0%	17.0	$5.17
15	4	90	38.9%	43.3%	27.8%	29.9	$5.16
16	5	620	24.0%	51.9%	15.5%	29.3	$5.53
17	6	550	33.8%	39.5%	15.8%	20.9	$5.12
18	5	246	32.5%	60.6%	18.7%	29.0	$5.91
19	2	33	54.6%	54.5%	9.1%	25.3	$5.42
20	5	282	40.8%	44.3%	25.5%	27.3	$6.29
21	4	165	43.0%	36.4%	11.5%	18.6	$7.66
22	4	141	39.0%	51.8%	14.9%	26.0	$5.82
VISN Avg			**37.8%**	**51.8%**	**16.8%**	**26.0**	**$5.69**
VISN S.D.			**9.1%**	**10.5%**	**5.3%**	**4.7**	**$0.60**
VETERAN Avg			**35.8%**	**51.4%**	**17.3%**	**26.9**	**$5.72**

† Includes all sites for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms on veterans discharged during FY01.

†† Includes all veterans for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms for FY01.

††† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories:
schizophrenia, psychotic disorder (other than schizophrenia), mood disorder and PTSD.

Table 8a. Unadjusted Critical Outcome Monitor Measures by VISN for FY01.

VISN †, ††	#SITES	# VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
1	7	766	1.4	49.4%	52.9%	36.0%	26.3%	33.2%	27.4%	20.9%
2	5	364	1.5	60.7%	61.3%	47.2%	40.4%	50.8%	19.0%	9.3%
3	6	557	1.5	51.2%	50.0%	38.8%	38.8%	38.6%	25.0%	18.0%
4	6	595	1.9	86.6%	85.6%	74.9%	53.8%	46.7%	19.7%	18.5%
5	4	357	1.7	75.3%	71.0%	60.3%	45.2%	36.7%	24.1%	8.7%
6	5	160	1.8	76.3%	75.6%	58.9%	29.9%	49.4%	23.8%	9.4%
7	7	473	1.5	62.3%	54.0%	45.6%	31.8%	43.3%	18.0%	20.9%
8	5	349	1.5	59.6%	59.8%	43.5%	28.4%	51.3%	9.5%	20.9%
9	3	293	1.5	58.6%	48.4%	31.5%	22.5%	33.4%	32.8%	12.6%
10	4	443	1.7	79.1%	79.8%	72.8%	67.7%	56.1%	26.9%	4.1%
11	3	138	1.4	44.3%	31.9%	32.8%	14.1%	34.8%	31.2%	6.5%
12	5	535	1.7	72.3%	68.7%	52.6%	38.8%	44.0%	28.8%	10.1%
13	5	261	1.7	70.3%	57.5%	58.5%	50.5%	36.4%	31.4%	10.3%
14	2	25	1.9	84.0%	100.0%	96.0%	100.0%	60.0%	8.0%	20.0%
15	4	90	1.8	48.8%	50.0%	43.1%	44.1%	37.8%	26.7%	20.0%
16	5	620	1.6	70.8%	72.2%	39.3%	34.3%	46.0%	31.1%	8.2%
17	6	550	1.6	55.3%	51.6%	46.4%	37.4%	28.9%	35.1%	19.5%
18	5	246	1.6	56.8%	60.3%	47.2%	54.5%	41.9%	39.4%	6.9%
19	2	33	1.4	34.8%	56.3%	51.9%	29.4%	45.5%	9.1%	6.1%
20	5	282	1.7	65.0%	70.4%	65.9%	60.4%	34.8%	30.9%	15.2%
21	4	165	1.2	45.0%	43.7%	30.8%	20.0%	29.7%	27.3%	26.7%
22	4	141	1.8	79.1%	77.9%	61.3%	55.8%	49.6%	7.1%	12.8%
VISN Average			**1.6**	**63.0%**	**62.7%**	**51.6%**	**42.0%**	**42.2%**	**24.2%**	**13.9%**
VISN SD			**0.2**	**14.1%**	**15.5%**	**16.1%**	**18.9%**	**8.5%**	**9.2%**	**6.4%**
Veteran Average			**1.6**	**64.1%**	**62.7%**	**49.2%**	**40.0%**	**41.4%**	**25.9%**	**14.4%**

† Includes all sites for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms on veterans discharged during FY01.

†† Includes all veterans for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms during FY01.

††† Only veterans with a problem in the clinical area were included in this analysis.

Table 8b. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of VISN's: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY01.†

			AVERAGE WORK	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††††	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE
VISN Median Value			1.60	55.3%	52.9%	52.6%	40.4%	43.3%	26.9%	12.6%
Veteran Average			1.60	64.1%	62.7%	49.2%	40.0%	41.4%	25.9%	14.4%
VISN	**#SITES**	**# VETS**	**IMPROVEMENT**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**	**%**
1	7	766	-0.13	-11.6%	0.0%	-16.5%	-11.2%	-3.3%	1.2%	7.8%
2	5	364	-0.07	-2.2%	3.6%	-2.8%	0.0%	9.3%	-7.6%	-3.4%
3	6	557	-0.03	-6.5%	-9.3%	-9.0%	4.3%	-2.6%	-2.0%	4.5%
4	6	595	0.28	28.4%	28.6%	31.4%	17.4%	3.6%	-8.0%	5.2%
5	4	357	0.13	14.6%	9.9%	9.5%	2.8%	-5.9%	-3.0%	-3.8%
6	5	160	0.25	17.2%	19.2%	14.0%	-12.2%	6.0%	-2.9%	-3.3%
7	7	473	-0.04	-6.1%	-15.9%	1.2%	-7.5%	0.0%	-8.3%	8.1%
8	5	349	-0.07	-12.5%	-4.9%	-11.9%	-16.8%	8.9%	-16.9%	8.0%
9	3	293	-0.07	-5.5%	-18.7%	-22.6%	-21.0%	-7.9%	6.2%	0.0%
10	4	443	0.15	21.3%	25.4%	31.1%	33.6%	14.4%	0.0%	-8.8%
11	3	138	-0.18	-20.3%	-28.8%	-13.0%	-27.0%	-6.2%	3.9%	-6.8%
12	5	535	0.13	9.7%	7.5%	0.0%	1.8%	3.6%	2.9%	-2.6%
13	5	261	0.15	7.3%	6.0%	15.6%	17.8%	-0.8%	5.2%	-2.3%
14	2	25	0.40	39.4%	55.7%	58.9%	70.1%	24.0%	-19.3%	7.6%
15	4	90	0.19	-26.2%	-24.1%	-11.5%	0.8%	-1.1%	1.1%	7.6%
16	5	620	-0.02	1.0%	5.4%	-10.2%	-4.9%	3.2%	5.3%	-4.7%
17	6	550	0.00	0.0%	-8.3%	-0.2%	-1.3%	-13.2%	7.9%	5.8%
18	5	246	0.03	-19.2%	-4.3%	-15.4%	15.0%	0.9%	13.4%	-5.8%
19	2	33	-0.11	-58.6%	-18.0%	-0.5%	-13.3%	8.9%	-16.8%	-7.3%
20	5	282	0.12	0.6%	11.5%	20.1%	24.5%	-6.1%	4.6%	2.7%
21	4	165	-0.30	-23.6%	-25.5%	-30.7%	-33.3%	-7.2%	0.9%	13.5%
22	4	141	0.26	20.9%	23.6%	14.8%	21.9%	13.0%	-18.0%	0.2%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, gender, previous employment history, residential history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses; including serious psychiatric illness and substance abuse problems.

†† Includes all sites for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms on veterans discharged during FY01.

††† Includes all veterans for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms during FY01.

†††† Only veterans with a problem in the clinical area were included in this analysis.

Table 9. Summary of Outliers by VISN for FY01.†

VISN	Number of Sites in VISN ††	Number of Veterans in VISN †††	VETERAN CHARACTERISTICS	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS†	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS†	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS†
1	7	766	0	1	5	6
2	5	364	0	0	1	1
3	6	557	0	0	1	1
4	6	595	1	0	1	2
5	4	357	0	0	0	0
6	5	160	0	0	0	0
7	7	473	0	1	2	3
8	5	349	0	0	4	4
9	3	293	1	2	4	7
10	4	443	0	1	0	1
11	3	138	0	1	4	5
12	5	535	0	1	0	1
13	5	261	0	1	0	1
14	2	25	0	1	0	1
15	4	90	0	1	2	3
16	5	620	1	0	0	1
17	6	550	0	2	3	5
18	5	246	0	0	3	3
19	2	33	0	0	1	1
20	5	282	0	1	0	1
21	4	165	0	2	6	8
22	4	141	0	0	0	0
VISN AVG			**0.1**	**0.7**	**1.7**	**2.5**
VISN SD			**0.3**	**0.7**	**1.9**	**2.3**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Fort Howard, VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14, Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO and Poplar Bluff, Kansas City and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan; and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

†† Includes all sites for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms on veterans discharged during FY01.

††† Includes all veterans for whom NEPEC received monitoring forms.

Table 10. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY01.

VISN		SITE†	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY01 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY01 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY01 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †† %
1	405	White River Junction	2	9	-7	22.2%
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	454	-110	75.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	54	-3	94.4%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	94	-8	91.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	184	-9	95.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	48	-13	72.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	68	5	107.4%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	35	19	154.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	52	-28	46.2%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	155	-46	70.3%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	70	-6	91.4%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	113	0	100.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	120	-5	95.8%
3	561	New Jersey HCS	152	312	-160	48.7%
3	561	East Orange, NJ	see above	see above	see above	see above
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	see above	see above	see above	see above
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	140	2	101.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	82	-16	80.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	171	-89	48.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	34	11	132.4%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	396	-135	65.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	96	-2	97.9%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	20	3	115.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	175	-5	97.1%
4	693	Wilkes-Barre, PA	2	3	-1	66.7%
5	512	Maryland HCS	53	91	-38	58.2%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	see above	see above	see above	see above
5	512A4	Ft. Howard, MD	see above	see above	see above	see above
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	see above	see above	see above	see above
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	208	14	106.7%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	84	-2	97.6%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	9	1	111.1%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	122	-36	70.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	23	1	104.3%
6	652	Richmond, VA	2	10	-8	20.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	44	-6	86.4%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	195	0	100.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	51	-1	98.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	42	12	128.6%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	51	29	156.9%
7	544	Columbia, SC	1	2	-1	50.0%
7	557	Dublin, GA	0	17	-17	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	31	-10	67.7%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	114	-42	63.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	146	-11	92.5%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	44	-5	88.6%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	32	3	109.4%
8	573	N. Florida/S.Georgia HCS	62	63	-1	98.4%
8	573	Gainesville, FL	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	573A4	Lake City, FL	see above	see above	see above	see above
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	110	-32	70.9%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	37	0	100.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	126	0	100.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	116	14	112.1%

Table 10 cont. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY01.

VISN		SITE†	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY01 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY01 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY01 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †† %
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	118	3	102.5%
10	539	Cinninati, OH	149	107	42	139.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	166	-2	98.8%
10	552	Dayton, OH	9	12	-3	75.0%
11	506	Ann Arbor, MI	0	28	-28	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	56	1	101.8%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	64	-14	78.1%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	32	-1	96.9%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	218	-13	94.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	210	-30	85.7%
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	7	9	-2	77.8%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	81	-4	95.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	62	4	106.5%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	15	0	100.0%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	69	-18	73.9%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	77	6	107.8%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	21	-9	57.1%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	104	-4	96.2%
14	636	Central Iowa HCS	25	101	-76	24.8%
14	636A6	Des Moines, IA	see above	see above	see above	see above
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	see above	see above	see above	see above
15	543	Columbia, MO	4	6	-2	66.7%
15	589	Kansas City, MO	0	97	-97	0.0%
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	1	1	0	100.0%
15	657	St.Louis, MO	0	16	-16	0.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	49	-26	46.9%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	62	0	100.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	132	-3	97.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	145	-10	93.1%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	50	0	100.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	261	-1	99.6%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	95	-49	48.4%
17	549	North Texas HCS	481	527	-46	91.3%
17	549	Dallas, TX	see above	see above	see above	see above
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	see above	see above	see above	see above
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	see above	see above	see above	see above
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	24	-1	95.8%
17	674	Central Texas HCS	46	139	-93	33.1%
17	674	Temple, TX	see above	see above	see above	see above
17	674A4	Waco, TX	see above	see above	see above	see above
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	25	-8	68.0%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	55	-3	94.5%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	108	14	113.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	53	-1	98.1%
18	756	El Paso, TX	3	3	0	100.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	30	-1	96.7%
19	666	Sheridan, WY	4	15	-11	26.7%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	37	-3	91.9%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	102	-14	86.3%
20	653	Roseburg/Eugene, OR	41	44	-3	93.2%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	83	-48	42.2%
20	692	White City, OR	84	86	-2	97.7%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	10	0	100.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	47	0	100.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	13	-1	92.3%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	114	-18	84.2%

Table 10 cont. Summary of Data Collection by Site for FY01.

VISN		SITE†	# of NEPEC Monitoring Forms for Veterans Discharged During FY01 N	VAHQ Annual Report of Discharges during FY01 N	Difference Between VAHQ Annual Report and NEPEC Monitoring Forms N	Percent of Discharges During FY01 for which Monitoring Data were Collected †† %
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	**23**	**63**	**-40**	**36.5%**
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	**89**	**85**	**4**	**104.7%**
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	**24**	**23**	**1**	**104.3%**
22	691	**West LA, CA**	**5**	**275**	**-270**	**1.8%**
22	691A4	**Sepulveda, CA**	**0**	**25**	**-25**	**0.0%**
Total			**7,443**	**9,103**	**-1,660**	**81.8%**
Site Average			**64**	**78**	**-14**	**70.8%**
Site S.D.			**76**	**90**	**37**	**41.4%**

† In their report to VHA Headquarters, the following CWT/VI program sites locations aggregated their data:

      The sites of Baltimore, Fort Howard and Perry Point make up the Maryland Health Care System.

      The sites of Des Moines and Knoxville make up the Central Iowa Health Care System.

      The sites of Dallas, Fort Worth and Bonham make up the North Texas Health Care System

      The sites of Gainesville and Lake City make up the North Florida/South Georgia Health Care System.

      The sites of Temple and Waco make up the Central Texas Health Care System.

      The sites of American Lake and Seattle make up the Puget Sound Health Care System

      The site of Eugene is reported within the statistics of Roseburg.

†† A percentage greater than 100% indicates a site that reported more discharges to NEPEC than to VAHQ.

Table 11. Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Age	GENDER	
					% males	% females
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	344	47.9	97.4%	2.6%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	51	46.4	84.3%	15.7%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	86	47.4	95.3%	4.7%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	175	47.5	96.0%	4.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	35	47.1	100.0%	0.0%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	73	48.1	94.5%	5.5%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	54	45.2	94.4%	5.6%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	24	43.6	100.0%	0.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	109	45.4	97.2%	2.8%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	64	45.9	98.4%	1.6%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	46.3	95.5%	4.5%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	115	46.7	99.1%	0.9%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	21	43.3	95.0%	5.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	131	45.4	96.9%	3.1%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	142	46.1	94.3%	5.7%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	66	47.7	98.5%	1.5%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	82	48.8	96.3%	3.7%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	45.8	97.8%	2.2%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	261	44.6	98.5%	1.5%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	94	43.9	96.8%	3.2%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	23	45.2	95.7%	4.3%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	170	45.7	98.2%	1.8%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	12	43.6	100.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	41	45.8	97.6%	2.4%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	222	46.8	95.9%	4.1%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	82	47.5	95.1%	4.9%
6	558	**Durham, NC**	10	44.2	90.0%	10.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	86	46.1	91.9%	8.1%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	47.8	95.8%	4.2%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	38	46.4	100.0%	0.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	195	45.3	89.7%	10.3%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	50	47.6	76.0%	24.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	54	44.1	90.6%	9.4%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	80	47.0	91.3%	8.8%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	21	46.3	95.2%	4.8%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	72	45.4	97.2%	2.8%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	135	47.3	94.0%	6.0%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	39	46.1	82.1%	17.9%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	35	48.4	97.1%	2.9%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	45.8	90.3%	9.7%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	78	44.8	98.7%	1.3%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	37	46.1	97.3%	2.7%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	126	46.9	97.6%	2.4%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	130	47.4	96.9%	3.1%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	121	44.9	98.3%	1.7%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	149	45.4	94.6%	5.4%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	164	45.9	93.2%	6.8%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	57	46.5	96.5%	3.5%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	50	47.7	98.0%	2.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	31	47.6	100.0%	0.0%

Table 11 cont. Mean Age and Gender by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Age	GENDER	
					% males	% females
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	205	45.2	98.5%	1.5%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	180	47.1	95.6%	4.4%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	77	46.4	96.1%	3.9%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	66	48.4	95.5%	4.5%
13	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**	15	47.5	93.3%	6.7%
13	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	51	49.6	96.1%	3.9%
13	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	83	48.8	96.4%	3.6%
13	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	12	46.5	100.0%	0.0%
13	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	100	48.0	98.0%	2.0%
14	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	18	44.3	100.0%	0.0%
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	23	47.4	100.0%	0.0%
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	62	46.3	96.7%	3.3%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	129	47.4	95.3%	4.7%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	135	47.7	92.6%	7.4%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	50	46.6	90.0%	10.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	260	45.8	96.9%	3.1%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	46	49.0	100.0%	0.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	346	46.5	95.7%	4.3%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	65	44.8	92.3%	7.7%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	70	46.7	94.2%	5.8%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	23	44.0	100.0%	0.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	23	47.1	100.0%	0.0%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	23	45.3	100.0%	0.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	17	48.9	100.0%	0.0%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	52	45.6	94.2%	5.8%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	122	49.8	97.5%	2.5%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	46.7	98.1%	1.9%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	29	49.1	96.6%	3.4%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	34	48.2	91.2%	8.8%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	88	44.4	98.9%	1.1%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	41	44.8	95.1%	4.9%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	35	44.9	94.3%	5.7%
20	692	**White City, OR**	84	46.7	100.0%	0.0%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	10	47.5	100.0%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	47	47.2	100.0%	0.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	51.8	100.0%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	96	46.9	94.8%	5.2%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	23	49.2	82.6%	17.4%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	89	46.3	97.8%	2.2%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	24	53.5	95.8%	4.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**46.5**	**95.8%**	**4.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**45.9**	**93.7%**	**4.1%**
SITE S.D.				**5.2**	**14.9%**	**4.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 12. Ethnicity by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	344	70.6%	19.2%	5.5%	4.7%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	51	60.8%	37.3%	2.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	86	82.6%	15.1%	1.2%	1.2%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	175	77.0%	17.2%	4.0%	1.7%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	35	82.9%	8.6%	0.0%	8.6%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	73	71.2%	21.9%	6.8%	0.0%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	54	35.2%	61.1%	0.0%	3.7%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	24	50.0%	37.5%	8.3%	4.2%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	109	41.3%	55.0%	1.8%	1.8%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	64	43.8%	50.0%	4.7%	1.6%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	44.2%	45.1%	8.8%	1.8%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	115	5.2%	67.8%	26.1%	0.9%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	21	4.8%	76.2%	4.8%	14.3%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	131	30.5%	64.1%	3.9%	1.6%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	142	30.5%	60.3%	7.1%	2.1%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	66	19.7%	68.2%	12.1%	0.0%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	82	67.1%	24.4%	7.3%	1.2%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	66.7%	31.1%	0.0%	2.2%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	261	24.2%	67.7%	5.4%	2.7%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	94	31.9%	63.8%	2.1%	2.1%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	23	13.0%	87.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	170	50.0%	48.2%	1.2%	0.6%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	12	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	41	31.7%	63.4%	4.9%	0.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	222	35.3%	56.6%	3.6%	4.5%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	82	4.9%	95.1%	0.0%	0.0%
6	558	**Durham, NC**	10	20.0%	80.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	86	17.4%	81.4%	1.2%	0.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	38	60.5%	36.8%	0.0%	2.6%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	195	7.7%	90.3%	1.0%	1.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	50	30.0%	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	54	18.5%	79.6%	0.0%	1.9%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	80	37.5%	62.5%	0.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	21	14.3%	81.0%	4.8%	0.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	72	37.5%	59.7%	1.4%	1.4%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	135	80.0%	16.3%	3.0%	0.7%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	39	30.8%	61.5%	7.7%	0.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	35	82.9%	11.4%	5.7%	0.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	64.5%	32.3%	1.6%	1.6%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	78	55.1%	42.3%	0.0%	2.6%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	37	21.6%	75.7%	2.7%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	126	69.0%	28.6%	0.8%	1.6%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	130	42.3%	56.9%	0.0%	0.8%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	121	63.6%	28.9%	4.1%	3.3%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	149	45.6%	53.7%	0.0%	0.7%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	164	26.8%	67.1%	3.7%	2.4%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	57	47.4%	38.6%	3.5%	10.5%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	50	62.0%	34.0%	2.0%	2.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	31	35.5%	48.4%	16.1%	0.0%

Table 12 cont. Ethnicity by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	White %	African American %	Hispanic %	Other %
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	205	23.4%	75.6%	0.5%	0.5%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	180	28.9%	66.1%	3.9%	1.1%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	77	67.5%	13.0%	14.3%	5.2%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	66	59.1%	39.4%	1.5%	0.0%
13	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**	15	73.3%	0.0%	6.7%	20.0%
13	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	51	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%
13	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	83	74.7%	10.8%	2.4%	12.0%
13	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	12	0.0%	83.3%	0.0%	16.7%
13	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	100	63.6%	26.3%	5.1%	5.1%
14	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	18	94.4%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	23	60.9%	34.8%	4.3%	0.0%
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	62	55.0%	40.0%	1.7%	3.3%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	129	48.8%	41.1%	7.0%	3.1%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	135	29.9%	56.0%	10.4%	3.7%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	50	20.0%	76.0%	0.0%	4.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	260	39.6%	59.6%	0.4%	0.4%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	46	55.6%	22.2%	8.9%	13.3%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	346	22.3%	75.4%	1.4%	0.9%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	65	49.2%	42.9%	6.3%	1.6%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	70	50.0%	45.7%	1.4%	2.9%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	23	43.5%	8.7%	47.8%	0.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	23	65.2%	30.4%	4.3%	0.0%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	23	59.1%	40.9%	0.0%	0.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	17	64.7%	5.9%	23.5%	5.9%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	52	67.3%	23.1%	3.8%	5.8%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	122	80.3%	5.7%	8.2%	5.7%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	69.2%	15.4%	13.5%	1.9%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	29	79.3%	6.9%	13.8%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	34	61.8%	23.5%	0.0%	14.7%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	88	79.5%	9.1%	4.5%	6.8%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	41	90.2%	4.9%	0.0%	4.9%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	35	65.7%	22.9%	0.0%	11.4%
20	692	**White City, OR**	84	81.0%	13.1%	2.4%	3.6%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	10	60.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	47	46.8%	40.4%	8.5%	4.3%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	83.3%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	96	30.2%	51.0%	14.6%	4.2%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	23	43.5%	52.2%	0.0%	4.3%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	89	50.6%	18.0%	23.6%	7.9%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	24	75.0%	12.5%	8.3%	4.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**45.7%**	**46.8%**	**4.5%**	**3.0%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**48.5%**	**42.5%**	**5.0%**	**4.0%**
SITE S.D.				**22.8%**	**25.3%**	**7.2%**	**8.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 13. Marital Status by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Married %	Separated, Widowed or Divorced %	Never Married %
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	344	8.2%	59.2%	32.7%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	51	7.8%	51.0%	41.2%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	86	8.2%	63.5%	28.2%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	175	5.9%	65.9%	28.2%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	35	8.8%	58.8%	32.4%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	73	22.2%	45.8%	31.9%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	54	3.9%	60.8%	35.3%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	24	4.2%	70.8%	25.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	109	6.4%	62.4%	31.2%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	64	7.9%	44.4%	47.6%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	8.1%	47.7%	44.1%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	115	6.1%	40.9%	53.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	21	14.3%	38.1%	47.6%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	131	6.2%	53.5%	40.3%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	142	5.7%	54.3%	40.0%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	66	9.1%	51.5%	39.4%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	82	12.3%	43.2%	44.4%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	8.9%	62.2%	28.9%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	261	5.8%	55.8%	38.4%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	94	9.6%	56.4%	34.0%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	23	4.3%	47.8%	47.8%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	170	7.6%	59.4%	32.9%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	12	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	41	10.5%	73.7%	15.8%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	222	6.8%	64.5%	28.6%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	82	6.1%	64.6%	29.3%
6	558	**Durham, NC**	10	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	86	9.5%	58.3%	32.1%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	12.5%	70.8%	16.7%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	38	10.5%	50.0%	39.5%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	195	6.7%	69.9%	23.3%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	50	6.0%	78.0%	16.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	54	7.4%	59.3%	33.3%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	80	6.3%	70.0%	23.8%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	21	14.3%	66.7%	19.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	72	8.7%	69.6%	21.7%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	135	3.0%	70.1%	26.9%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	39	7.7%	56.4%	35.9%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	35	8.8%	79.4%	11.8%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	8.2%	70.5%	21.3%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	78	7.8%	70.1%	22.1%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	37	22.2%	55.6%	22.2%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	126	2.4%	80.0%	17.6%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	130	10.2%	86.7%	3.1%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	121	7.6%	66.4%	26.1%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	149	5.6%	70.1%	24.3%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	164	6.7%	63.2%	30.1%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	57	14.0%	64.9%	21.1%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	50	2.0%	86.0%	12.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	31	6.5%	61.3%	32.3%

45

Table 13 cont. Marital Status by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Married %	Separated, Widowed or Divorced %	Never Married %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	8.8%	62.4%	28.8%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	14.4%	58.3%	27.2%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	7.8%	64.9%	27.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	3.0%	68.2%	28.8%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	0.0%	73.3%	26.7%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	16.3%	53.1%	30.6%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	5.1%	64.6%	30.4%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	0.0%	58.3%	41.7%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	10.2%	58.2%	31.6%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	9.5%	76.2%	14.3%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	9.8%	75.4%	14.8%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	6.2%	65.1%	28.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	6.7%	68.1%	25.2%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	12.2%	65.3%	22.4%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	4.2%	71.9%	23.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	10.9%	71.7%	17.4%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	7.9%	69.9%	22.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	6.3%	78.1%	15.6%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	7.2%	76.8%	15.9%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	13.0%	65.2%	21.7%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	9.1%	68.2%	22.7%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	14.3%	52.4%	33.3%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	6.3%	62.5%	31.3%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	11.8%	64.7%	23.5%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	4.2%	73.1%	22.7%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	5.9%	58.8%	35.3%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	17.9%	67.9%	14.3%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	2.9%	70.6%	26.5%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	8.0%	67.8%	24.1%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	12.2%	61.0%	26.8%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	17.1%	48.6%	34.3%
20	692	White City, OR	84	2.4%	71.4%	26.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	10.0%	50.0%	40.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	0.0%	72.3%	27.7%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	9.1%	54.5%	36.4%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	4.3%	57.0%	38.7%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	18.2%	68.2%	13.6%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	20.5%	63.6%	15.9%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**7.9%**	**63.7%**	**28.4%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**8.7%**	**62.7%**	**28.5%**
SITE S.D.				**5.7%**	**10.7%**	**9.6%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 14. Educational Histories by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	< 12 Years %	12 Years %	> 12 Years %
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	344	8.1%	60.5%	31.4%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	51	7.8%	52.9%	39.2%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	86	8.1%	51.2%	40.7%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	175	11.4%	56.6%	32.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	35	14.3%	60.0%	25.7%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	73	6.8%	52.1%	41.1%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	54	3.7%	55.6%	40.7%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	24	20.8%	41.7%	37.5%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	109	11.9%	57.8%	30.3%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	64	3.1%	46.9%	50.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	15.9%	44.2%	39.8%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	115	7.8%	57.4%	34.8%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	21	0.0%	47.6%	52.4%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	131	4.6%	58.0%	37.4%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	142	7.0%	42.3%	50.7%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	66	13.6%	39.4%	47.0%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	82	18.3%	42.7%	39.0%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	6.7%	64.4%	28.9%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	261	8.0%	54.0%	37.9%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	94	3.2%	74.5%	22.3%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	23	13.0%	69.6%	17.4%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	170	6.5%	64.7%	28.8%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	12	8.3%	66.7%	25.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	41	7.3%	43.9%	48.8%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	222	11.7%	50.0%	38.3%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	82	8.5%	50.0%	41.5%
6	558	**Durham, NC**	10	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	86	8.1%	60.5%	31.4%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	4.2%	54.2%	41.7%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	38	15.8%	47.4%	36.8%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	195	7.7%	32.3%	60.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	50	8.0%	34.0%	58.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	54	0.0%	38.9%	61.1%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	80	2.5%	51.3%	46.3%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	21	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	72	8.3%	45.8%	45.8%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	135	9.6%	41.5%	48.9%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	39	5.1%	46.2%	48.7%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	35	8.6%	42.9%	48.6%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	8.1%	56.5%	35.5%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	78	3.8%	44.9%	51.3%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	37	16.2%	56.8%	27.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	126	7.1%	51.6%	41.3%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	130	10.0%	53.1%	36.9%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	121	5.8%	56.2%	38.0%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	149	10.7%	49.0%	40.3%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	164	6.1%	65.9%	28.0%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	57	8.8%	45.6%	45.6%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	50	10.0%	52.0%	38.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	31	6.5%	67.7%	25.8%

Table 14 cont. Educational Histories by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	< 12 Years %	12 Years %	> 12 Years %
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	205	6.3%	41.5%	52.2%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	180	6.7%	37.8%	55.6%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	77	5.2%	45.5%	49.4%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	66	7.6%	43.9%	48.5%
13	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**	15	20.0%	53.3%	26.7%
13	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	51	13.7%	47.1%	39.2%
13	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	83	2.4%	54.2%	43.4%
13	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	12	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
13	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	100	5.0%	54.0%	41.0%
14	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	18	0.0%	44.4%	55.6%
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	23	4.3%	47.8%	47.8%
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	62	6.5%	53.2%	40.3%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	129	7.8%	48.1%	44.2%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	135	6.7%	50.4%	43.0%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	50	2.0%	52.0%	46.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	260	8.1%	53.1%	38.8%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	46	8.7%	52.2%	39.1%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	346	5.8%	54.6%	39.6%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	65	3.1%	49.2%	47.7%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	70	10.0%	58.6%	31.4%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	23	8.7%	39.1%	52.2%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	23	8.7%	52.2%	39.1%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	23	8.7%	43.5%	47.8%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	17	5.9%	52.9%	41.2%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	52	3.8%	36.5%	59.6%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	122	8.2%	41.8%	50.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	3.8%	38.5%	57.7%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	29	6.9%	55.2%	37.9%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	34	0.0%	38.2%	61.8%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	88	5.7%	47.7%	46.6%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	41	0.0%	56.1%	43.9%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	35	0.0%	42.9%	57.1%
20	692	**White City, OR**	84	8.3%	44.0%	47.6%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	10	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	47	14.9%	27.7%	57.4%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	8.3%	41.7%	50.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	96	4.2%	43.8%	52.1%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	23	7.6%	50.6%	41.8%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	89	13.0%	56.5%	30.4%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	24	4.5%	49.4%	46.1%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**7.6%**	**50.7%**	**41.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**7.3%**	**50.2%**	**42.4%**
SITE S.D.				**4.5%**	**8.8%**	**9.7%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 15. Military Service Era by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Persian Gulf %	Post-Vietnam %	Vietnam %	Pre-Vietnam %	Korean %	All Other Service Eras %
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	344	1.7%	32.8%	56.1%	6.7%	2.6%	0.0%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	51	7.8%	41.2%	39.2%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	86	5.9%	35.3%	54.1%	2.4%	2.4%	0.0%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	175	2.9%	33.3%	53.4%	9.8%	0.6%	0.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	35	14.3%	25.7%	45.7%	11.4%	2.9%	0.0%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	73	4.1%	34.2%	54.8%	4.1%	1.4%	1.4%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	54	7.4%	46.3%	40.7%	3.7%	1.9%	0.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	24	4.2%	62.5%	25.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	109	1.8%	47.7%	45.9%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	64	3.2%	34.9%	57.1%	3.2%	1.6%	0.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	3.5%	47.8%	45.1%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	115	7.0%	43.5%	44.3%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	21	4.8%	57.1%	28.6%	4.8%	4.8%	0.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	131	9.2%	45.8%	39.7%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	142	6.4%	53.2%	36.2%	3.5%	0.7%	0.0%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	66	0.0%	47.7%	38.5%	7.7%	6.2%	0.0%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	82	7.4%	29.6%	48.1%	8.6%	2.5%	3.7%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	4.4%	48.9%	44.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	261	8.4%	51.0%	39.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	94	6.4%	55.3%	35.1%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	23	4.3%	65.2%	26.1%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	170	4.1%	45.3%	48.2%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	12	0.0%	81.8%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	41	2.4%	56.1%	39.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	222	4.1%	46.2%	46.2%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	82	0.0%	41.5%	54.9%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
6	558	**Durham, NC**	10	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	86	4.7%	41.9%	52.3%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	8.3%	33.3%	54.2%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	38	5.3%	50.0%	39.5%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	195	4.1%	47.4%	46.9%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	50	6.0%	38.0%	50.0%	4.0%	0.0%	2.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	54	11.1%	50.0%	35.2%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	80	2.5%	36.3%	53.8%	6.3%	1.3%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	21	0.0%	61.9%	38.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	72	6.9%	56.9%	27.8%	4.2%	2.8%	1.4%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	135	3.0%	40.0%	49.6%	6.7%	0.0%	0.7%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	39	10.3%	43.6%	38.5%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	35	5.7%	28.6%	60.0%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	13.1%	27.9%	54.1%	3.3%	1.6%	0.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	78	9.1%	46.8%	42.9%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	37	5.4%	40.5%	54.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	126	2.4%	39.7%	52.4%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	130	3.1%	33.1%	56.2%	6.9%	0.8%	0.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	121	5.0%	49.6%	42.1%	1.7%	0.8%	0.8%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	149	6.1%	41.2%	49.3%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	164	2.5%	41.1%	52.8%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	57	8.9%	28.6%	60.7%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	50	2.0%	32.0%	60.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	31	3.2%	32.3%	61.3%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 15 cont. Military Service Era by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Persian Gulf %	Post-Vietnam %	Vietnam %	Pre-Vietnam %	Korean %	All Other Service Eras %
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	205	8.8%	45.1%	44.1%	1.5%	0.5%	0.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	180	5.0%	33.9%	57.8%	2.2%	1.1%	0.0%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	77	6.5%	36.4%	53.2%	2.6%	0.0%	1.3%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	66	3.0%	33.3%	54.5%	7.6%	1.5%	0.0%
13	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**	15	0.0%	20.0%	66.7%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%
13	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	51	3.9%	29.4%	49.0%	11.8%	5.9%	0.0%
13	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	83	1.2%	38.3%	53.1%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%
13	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	12	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
13	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	100	7.0%	33.0%	53.0%	2.0%	5.0%	0.0%
14	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	18	11.8%	41.2%	47.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	23	4.3%	30.4%	60.9%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	62	0.0%	58.1%	35.5%	4.8%	1.6%	0.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	129	3.9%	39.8%	51.6%	3.9%	0.0%	0.8%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	135	9.7%	32.1%	52.2%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	50	10.0%	36.0%	52.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	260	3.5%	51.2%	42.3%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	46	0.0%	23.9%	69.6%	4.3%	2.2%	0.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	346	4.0%	43.9%	48.0%	3.5%	0.6%	0.0%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	65	7.7%	63.1%	27.7%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	70	7.1%	28.6%	60.0%	2.9%	1.4%	0.0%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	23	8.7%	52.2%	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	23	0.0%	52.2%	39.1%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	23	0.0%	43.5%	56.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	17	17.6%	11.8%	58.8%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	52	17.3%	23.1%	55.8%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	122	4.1%	20.5%	63.1%	9.8%	1.6%	0.8%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	5.8%	38.5%	51.9%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	29	0.0%	39.3%	53.6%	3.6%	3.6%	0.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	34	2.9%	38.2%	50.0%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	88	3.4%	46.6%	48.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	41	17.1%	26.8%	51.2%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	35	11.4%	45.7%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%
20	692	**White City, OR**	84	2.4%	41.7%	52.4%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	10	0.0%	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	47	6.4%	36.2%	55.3%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	0.0%	0.0%	75.0%	16.7%	8.3%	0.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	96	2.1%	34.4%	58.3%	4.2%	1.0%	0.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	23	5.1%	41.0%	48.8%	4.3%	0.7%	0.2%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	89	0.0%	21.7%	69.6%	8.7%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	24	11.2%	25.8%	56.2%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				5.1%	40.9%	48.8%	4.3%	0.7%	0.2%
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				5.2%	40.4%	48.8%	4.6%	0.8%	0.2%
SITE S.D.				4.1%	12.3%	10.4%	3.4%	1.5%	0.6%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 16. Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY01.

VISN		SITE	N	VA Inpatient Referral %	VA Outpatient Referral %	VA Domiciliary Referral %	Non-VA Health Care Referral %	Self- Referred %	Vet Center Referral %	Other %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	8.8%	37.1%	23.1%	1.5%	11.7%	1.5%	16.4%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	17.6%	66.7%	9.8%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	2.3%	7.0%	87.2%	2.3%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	14.3%	2.9%	1.1%	65.7%	14.3%	0.6%	1.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	17.1%	2.9%	2.9%	48.6%	25.7%	2.9%	0.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	1.4%	75.3%	2.7%	2.7%	16.4%	0.0%	1.4%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	8.3%	8.3%	79.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	4.7%	70.3%	0.0%	1.6%	21.9%	1.6%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	5.3%	33.6%	18.6%	14.2%	19.5%	2.7%	6.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	0.0%	95.7%	1.7%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	9.5%	85.7%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	2.3%	2.3%	93.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	4.2%	4.9%	89.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	0.0%	63.6%	30.3%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	15.9%	29.3%	17.1%	9.8%	18.3%	1.2%	8.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	0.0%	4.4%	93.3%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	0.0%	5.7%	93.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	91.5%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	4.3%	47.8%	0.0%	13.0%	34.8%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	5.3%	45.9%	41.2%	1.2%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	8.3%	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	24.4%	22.0%	53.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	2.7%	3.2%	92.8%	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	0.0%	82.9%	8.5%	1.2%	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	3.5%	2.3%	94.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	91.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	39.5%	39.5%	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	0.0%	5.3%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	0.0%	88.2%	0.5%	10.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	0.0%	90.0%	4.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	2.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	1.9%	92.6%	0.0%	1.9%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	0.0%	96.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	11.1%	80.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%	0.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	46.7%	10.4%	17.8%	0.7%	22.2%	0.0%	2.2%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	28.2%	64.1%	0.0%	2.6%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	14.3%	65.7%	0.0%	0.0%	17.1%	0.0%	2.9%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	0.0%	35.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	62.9%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	0.0%	89.7%	0.0%	6.4%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	2.7%	97.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	0.0%	95.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	7.7%	90.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	15.7%	28.1%	39.7%	9.1%	1.7%	0.8%	5.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	32.2%	14.1%	36.2%	9.4%	7.4%	0.0%	0.7%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	1.2%	47.6%	48.8%	0.6%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%

Table 16 cont. Referral Source to CWT/VI Program by Site for FY01.†

VISN	SITE	N	VA Inpatient Referral %	VA Outpatient Referral %	VA Domiciliary Referral %	Non-VA Health Care Referral %	Self-Referred %	Vet Center Referral %	Other %
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	26.3%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	2.0%	92.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	0.0%	87.1%	0.0%	3.2%	3.2%	0.0%	6.5%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	20.5%	11.2%	68.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	51.7%	36.1%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.6%	3.3%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	1.3%	64.9%	1.3%	0.0%	26.0%	0.0%	6.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	1.5%	21.2%	63.6%	1.5%	9.1%	0.0%	3.0%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%	6.7%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	9.8%	29.4%	9.8%	0.0%	45.1%	5.9%	0.0%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	4.8%	0.0%	84.3%	0.0%	9.6%	0.0%	1.2%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	39.0%	10.0%	37.0%	1.0%	10.0%	2.0%	1.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	0.0%	27.8%	72.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	26.1%	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	30.4%	4.3%	0.0%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	0.0%	0.0%	93.5%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	3.1%	7.8%	83.7%	0.0%	4.7%	0.8%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	1.5%	91.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	4.4%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	24.0%	40.0%	0.0%	2.0%	24.0%	4.0%	6.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	4.2%	38.5%	54.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	2.2%	97.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	16.2%	59.8%	1.2%	2.0%	19.1%	0.9%	0.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	10.0%	5.7%	0.0%	10.0%	61.4%	11.4%	1.4%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	0.0%	95.7%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	8.7%	8.7%	56.5%	8.7%	8.7%	0.0%	8.7%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	13.0%	8.7%	43.5%	8.7%	26.1%	0.0%	0.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	23.5%	41.2%	5.9%	0.0%	29.4%	0.0%	0.0%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	13.5%	86.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	0.8%	5.7%	78.7%	0.8%	13.9%	0.0%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	65.4%	26.9%	0.0%	1.9%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	6.9%	69.0%	0.0%	3.4%	20.7%	0.0%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	2.9%	5.9%	50.0%	0.0%	5.9%	2.9%	32.4%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	0.0%	0.0%	80.7%	1.1%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	43.9%	7.3%	0.0%	2.4%	46.3%	0.0%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	2.9%	68.6%	22.9%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	2.9%
20	692	White City, OR	84	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	40.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	8.5%	4.3%	68.1%	8.5%	8.5%	2.1%	0.0%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	16.7%	66.7%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	0.0%	87.5%	0.0%	7.3%	3.1%	2.1%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	0.0%	95.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	0.0%	98.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	4.2%	91.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**11.0%**	**40.0%**	**34.0%**	**3.8%**	**7.7%**	**0.8%**	**2.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**10.9%**	**43.7%**	**26.8%**	**3.8%**	**8.9%**	**0.9%**	**2.9%**
SITE S.D.				**17.7%**	**35.9%**	**35.9%**	**11.0%**	**12.9%**	**2.0%**	**8.6%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre

VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15,

Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 17. Usual Employment Pattern Past Three Years by Site for FY01.†

VISN	SITE		N	Usually Employed or in a Constructive Activity†† %	Retired or Disabled %	Usually Unemployed %	Other %
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	344	61.3%	4.5%	24.7%	9.5%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	51	43.1%	11.8%	23.5%	21.6%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	86	66.7%	14.3%	13.1%	6.0%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	175	78.2%	8.6%	13.2%	0.0%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	35	57.1%	28.6%	11.4%	2.9%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	73	56.3%	16.9%	23.9%	2.8%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	54	59.6%	1.9%	32.7%	5.8%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	24	91.7%	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	109	75.2%	0.0%	20.2%	4.6%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	64	73.4%	4.7%	18.8%	3.1%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	57.9%	18.7%	15.0%	8.4%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	115	30.4%	0.0%	69.6%	0.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	21	85.7%	4.8%	4.8%	4.8%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	131	86.2%	1.5%	10.8%	1.5%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	142	72.9%	0.7%	25.7%	0.7%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	66	56.1%	6.1%	34.8%	3.0%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	82	51.9%	12.7%	32.9%	2.5%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	75.6%	6.7%	11.1%	6.7%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	261	80.5%	2.3%	12.8%	4.3%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	94	72.0%	1.1%	26.9%	0.0%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	23	91.3%	0.0%	8.7%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	170	74.6%	4.7%	15.4%	5.3%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	12	50.0%	0.0%	41.7%	8.3%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	41	75.6%	9.8%	12.2%	2.4%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	222	75.6%	3.3%	17.8%	3.3%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	82	77.8%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%
6	558	**Durham, NC**	10	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	86	84.9%	4.7%	8.1%	2.3%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	87.5%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	38	67.6%	10.8%	13.5%	8.1%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	195	90.2%	1.0%	8.2%	0.5%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	50	54.0%	28.0%	14.0%	4.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	54	74.1%	9.3%	14.8%	1.9%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	80	86.3%	3.8%	10.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	21	95.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	72	80.3%	9.9%	9.9%	0.0%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	135	83.5%	0.8%	13.5%	2.3%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	39	69.2%	2.6%	28.2%	0.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	35	82.9%	0.0%	17.1%	0.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	77.4%	11.3%	9.7%	1.6%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	78	97.4%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	37	67.6%	11.8%	14.7%	5.9%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	126	91.2%	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	130	70.4%	24.8%	3.2%	1.6%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	121	75.0%	5.8%	14.2%	5.0%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	149	89.3%	6.7%	3.4%	0.7%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	164	71.1%	3.1%	25.2%	0.6%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	57	82.1%	1.8%	14.3%	1.8%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	50	83.7%	6.1%	8.2%	2.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	31	64.5%	16.1%	19.4%	0.0%

Table 17 cont. Usual Employment Pattern Past Three Years by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Usually Employed or in a Constructive Activity†† %	Retired or Disabled %	Usually Unemployed %	Other %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	91.2%	3.4%	4.9%	0.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	67.4%	12.4%	18.0%	2.2%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	80.3%	14.5%	3.9%	1.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	60.0%	16.9%	21.5%	1.5%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	75.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	62.0%	14.0%	20.0%	4.0%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	79.3%	8.5%	9.8%	2.4%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	66.7%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	66.7%	17.2%	16.2%	0.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	61.1%	5.6%	33.3%	0.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	72.7%	9.1%	13.6%	4.5%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	93.2%	5.1%	1.7%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	89.1%	0.8%	8.5%	1.6%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	63.4%	8.4%	20.6%	7.6%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	78.0%	8.0%	10.0%	4.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	79.6%	7.3%	12.3%	0.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	78.3%	8.7%	13.0%	0.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	80.8%	7.1%	9.5%	2.7%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	67.7%	6.2%	24.6%	1.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	75.4%	4.9%	18.0%	1.6%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	78.3%	0.0%	17.4%	4.3%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	78.3%	4.3%	17.4%	0.0%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	85.0%	0.0%	10.0%	5.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	94.1%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	74.5%	3.9%	13.7%	7.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	88.5%	4.9%	3.3%	3.3%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	94.2%	1.9%	3.8%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	82.1%	7.1%	3.6%	7.1%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	73.5%	2.9%	17.6%	5.9%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	72.4%	6.9%	16.1%	4.6%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	70.0%	0.0%	22.5%	7.5%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	67.6%	0.0%	17.6%	14.7%
20	692	White City, OR	84	77.8%	1.2%	18.5%	2.5%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	66.0%	4.3%	23.4%	6.4%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	50.0%	41.7%	8.3%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	50.0%	9.6%	35.1%	5.3%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	74.5%	6.4%	15.9%	3.1%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	65.2%	4.3%	21.7%	8.7%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	61.4%	6.8%	26.1%	5.7%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**74.5%**	**6.4%**	**16.0%**	**3.1%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**74.3%**	**6.6%**	**15.7%**	**3.4%**
SITE S.D.				**13.0%**	**7.2%**	**10.4%**	**3.8%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

†† Includes full- and part-time employment, student and/or volunteer.

Table 18. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN	SITE		N	0 Days %	1-19 Days %	> 19 Days %	Mean Number of Days Worked for Pay #	Mean Employment Income Past 30 Days $
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	84.0%	14.8%	1.2%	1.3	$70.82
1	523	Boston, MA	51	96.1%	3.9%	0.0%	0.4	$9.94
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	97.7%	0.0%	2.3%	0.5	$36.28
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	94.3%	3.4%	2.3%	0.8	$20.38
1	650	Providence, RI	35	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	90.4%	6.8%	2.7%	1.4	$67.07
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	94.4%	5.6%	0.0%	0.4	$29.07
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	99.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0	$1.93
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	87.5%	7.8%	4.7%	2.0	$68.05
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	92.9%	6.2%	0.9%	0.8	$38.13
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	98.3%	1.7%	0.0%	0.1	$5.91
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	76.2%	4.8%	19.0%	5.6	$229.76
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	91.6%	4.6%	3.8%	1.4	$56.20
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	93.0%	2.8%	4.2%	1.3	$37.70
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
3	632	Northport, NY	82	93.9%	3.7%	2.4%	0.8	$22.87
4	529	Butler, PA	45	97.8%	0.0%	2.2%	0.5	$35.44
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	93.1%	3.4%	3.4%	1.2	$35.36
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	91.3%	4.3%	4.3%	1.7	$41.91
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	94.1%	4.7%	1.2%	0.5	$19.81
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	83.3%	8.3%	8.3%	3.0	$116.67
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	92.7%	7.3%	0.0%	0.4	$24.93
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	97.7%	0.5%	1.8%	0.6	$12.24
5	688	Washington, DC	82	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	0.2	$6.34
6	558	Durham, NC	10	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	1.5	$63.00
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	98.8%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0	$0.06
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	87.5%	12.5%	0.0%	1.4	$29.17
6	658	Salem, VA	38	94.7%	5.3%	0.0%	0.3	$8.16
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	79.5%	15.9%	4.6%	2.1	$64.42
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	94.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.7	$17.90
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	74.1%	22.2%	3.7%	2.1	$65.94
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	87.5%	7.5%	5.0%	1.5	$63.08
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	97.2%	2.8%	0.0%	0.1	$1.53
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	85.9%	9.6%	4.4%	1.8	$43.23
8	546	Miami, FL	39	92.3%	2.6%	5.1%	1.5	$30.77
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	54.3%	20.0%	25.7%	7.0	$248.31
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	87.1%	8.1%	4.8%	1.6	$49.05
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	89.7%	5.1%	5.1%	1.5	$48.79
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	91.9%	8.1%	0.0%	0.2	$12.97
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	99.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.1	$1.54
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	87.3%	5.9%	6.8%	2.2	$61.61
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	95.3%	2.7%	2.0%	0.7	$40.04
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	92.1%	4.3%	3.7%	1.3	$13.70
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	78.9%	15.8%	5.3%	1.7	$64.26
11	550	Danville, IL	50	78.0%	12.0%	10.0%	3.2	$147.80
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	80.6%	12.9%	6.5%	3.0	$56.39

Table 18 cont. Days Worked for Pay During the Month Prior to CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	0 Days %	1-19 Days %	> 19 Days %	Mean Number of Days Worked for Pay #	Mean Employment Income Past 30 Days $
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	96.6%	2.9%	0.5%	0.5	$16.02
12	578	Hines, IL	180	90.0%	7.2%	2.8%	1.1	$67.00
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	93.5%	6.5%	0.0%	0.6	$29.03
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	92.4%	7.6%	0.0%	0.5	$14.73
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	1.3	$45.33
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	86.3%	11.8%	2.0%	1.4	$27.76
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	95.2%	2.4%	2.4%	0.7	$19.78
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	90.0%	8.0%	2.0%	1.0	$41.11
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	94.4%	5.6%	0.0%	0.3	$10.00
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	87.0%	8.7%	4.3%	1.5	$59.57
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	91.5%	7.8%	0.8%	0.7	$26.42
16	580	Houston, TX	135	91.1%	5.9%	3.0%	1.3	$25.73
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	70.0%	18.0%	12.0%	5.1	$138.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	95.4%	4.6%	0.0%	0.4	$14.69
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	84.8%	15.2%	0.0%	1.1	$31.74
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	78.3%	16.8%	4.9%	2.5	$85.53
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	98.5%	1.5%	0.0%	0.1	$6.15
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	68.6%	15.7%	15.7%	4.9	$154.91
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	69.6%	26.1%	4.3%	3.7	$111.48
17	674	Temple, TX	23	78.3%	13.0%	8.7%	2.7	$55.09
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	95.7%	0.0%	4.3%	0.9	$48.61
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	$0.00
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	73.1%	17.3%	9.6%	3.3	$124.69
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	86.8%	12.4%	0.8%	1.2	$48.11
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	90.4%	7.7%	1.9%	1.0	$27.98
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	89.7%	6.9%	3.4%	1.5	$33.76
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	85.3%	11.8%	2.9%	1.8	$33.38
20	648	Portland, OR	88	93.2%	2.3%	4.5%	1.2	$35.16
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	95.1%	4.9%	0.0%	0.1	$5.15
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	74.3%	22.9%	2.9%	2.7	$114.34
20	692	White City, OR	84	97.6%	2.4%	0.0%	0.2	$5.36
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	60.0%	30.0%	10.0%	4.5	$153.40
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	87.2%	12.8%	0.0%	0.4	$34.85
21	654	Reno, NV	12	91.7%	8.3%	0.0%	0.4	$18.33
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	89.6%	9.4%	1.0%	0.6	$21.82
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	82.6%	8.7%	8.7%	2.8	$106.57
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	94.4%	5.6%	0.0%	0.5	$14.31
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	91.7%	4.2%	4.2%	1.3	$16.25
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**90.6%**	**6.8%**	**2.6%**	**1.1**	**$39.17**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**89.6%**	**7.4%**	**3.1%**	**1.3**	**$43.79**
SITE S.D.				**9.2%**	**6.4%**	**4.3%**	**1.3**	**$47.42**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 19. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Prior CWT/VI Admission %	Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	67.7%	36.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	66.7%	15.7%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	46.5%	82.4%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	53.1%	6.9%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	37.1%	88.6%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	32.4%	6.8%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	32.1%	1.9%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	16.7%	20.8%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	27.5%	100.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	45.3%	0.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	51.4%	14.2%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	11.4%	0.9%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	28.6%	9.5%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	17.8%	74.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	26.8%	81.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	18.2%	25.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	60.5%	37.8%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	8.9%	93.3%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	33.1%	94.3%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	30.9%	0.0%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	26.1%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	40.6%	38.2%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	0.0%	8.3%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	9.8%	78.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	35.3%	94.6%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	23.2%	0.0%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	30.0%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	15.1%	88.4%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	13.0%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	47.4%	2.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	27.5%	2.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	42.0%	22.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	16.7%	0.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	17.5%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	23.5%	100.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	30.6%	1.4%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	35.6%	32.1%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	17.9%	10.3%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	8.6%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	19.4%	0.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	10.4%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	18.9%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	18.4%	100.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	41.5%	5.4%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	24.0%	62.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	7.4%	69.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	16.5%	48.2%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	16.1%	8.8%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	30.0%	46.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	25.8%	3.2%

Table 19 cont. Prior CWT/VI Admission and Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit at Time of Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Prior CWT/VI Admission %	Currently in a Domiciliary or VA Inpatient Unit %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	28.3%	85.9%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	33.5%	5.6%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	29.9%	9.1%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	24.2%	65.2%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	13.3%	0.0%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	62.7%	2.0%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	44.6%	97.6%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	8.3%	0.0%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	49.5%	72.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	27.8%	66.7%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	45.5%	13.0%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	9.7%	91.8%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	20.2%	96.1%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	23.7%	6.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	10.0%	4.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	36.9%	42.7%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	34.8%	0.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	43.4%	16.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	16.9%	100.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	32.9%	5.7%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	13.0%	0.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	30.4%	87.0%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	18.2%	73.9%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	11.8%	17.6%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	21.2%	5.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	25.4%	82.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	7.7%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	21.4%	6.9%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	23.5%	47.1%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	20.5%	78.4%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	22.5%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	28.6%	20.0%
20	692	White City, OR	84	19.0%	100.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	10.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	17.0%	63.8%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	41.7%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	32.3%	2.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	26.1%	4.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	18.2%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	16.7%	0.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**31.0%**	**40.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**26.9%**	**33.1%**
SITE S.D.				**14.1%**	**37.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 20. Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY01.

VISN	SITE	N	Service Connected for Psychiatry %	Service Connected for Other %	Non-Service Connected Pension %	Any VA Benefit %	Social Security Disability %	Any VA or Non-VA Disability %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	8.1%	11.0%	5.5%	22.4%	25.6%	38.7%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	7.8%	9.8%	3.9%	21.6%	11.8%	27.5%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	2.3%	18.6%	12.8%	31.4%	9.3%	30.2%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	9.1%	6.3%	2.9%	17.7%	13.7%	27.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	2.9%	8.6%	14.3%	22.9%	22.9%	34.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	6.8%	9.6%	9.6%	24.7%	27.4%	39.7%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	5.6%	7.4%	3.7%	16.7%	3.7%	16.7%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	1.8%	5.5%	0.0%	7.3%	0.9%	7.3%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	3.1%	10.9%	12.5%	26.6%	14.1%	28.1%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	11.5%	7.1%	6.2%	23.9%	15.9%	32.7%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	3.5%	12.2%	5.2%	19.1%	4.3%	18.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	9.5%	19.0%	4.8%	23.8%	14.3%	33.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	3.1%	6.9%	0.0%	8.4%	3.8%	11.5%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	5.6%	12.7%	2.1%	19.0%	9.2%	24.6%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	6.1%	7.6%	13.6%	27.3%	15.2%	27.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	12.2%	15.9%	4.9%	25.6%	26.8%	41.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	4.4%	17.8%	4.4%	24.4%	6.7%	26.7%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	0.4%	13.8%	2.7%	16.5%	2.7%	16.9%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	4.3%	7.4%	1.1%	12.8%	1.1%	13.8%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	0.0%	17.4%	26.1%	39.1%	13.0%	34.8%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	4.7%	16.5%	2.9%	22.4%	2.9%	22.4%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	7.3%	7.3%	2.4%	17.1%	9.8%	24.4%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	4.5%	8.1%	5.0%	16.7%	4.5%	17.1%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	3.7%	6.1%	2.4%	11.0%	4.9%	13.4%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	3.5%	15.1%	0.0%	17.4%	3.5%	20.9%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	8.7%	4.3%	4.3%	17.4%	0.0%	13.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	18.4%	10.5%	7.9%	26.3%	10.5%	23.7%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	2.6%	17.4%	0.0%	19.0%	3.1%	22.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	12.0%	14.0%	12.0%	32.0%	14.0%	32.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	3.7%	11.1%	3.7%	18.5%	11.1%	22.2%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	6.3%	16.3%	7.5%	23.8%	12.5%	30.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	9.5%	0.0%	9.5%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	1.4%	9.7%	4.2%	15.3%	6.9%	18.1%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	2.2%	10.4%	0.0%	11.9%	0.0%	11.9%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	0.0%	33.3%	2.6%	35.9%	0.0%	33.3%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	11.4%	14.3%	0.0%	22.9%	5.7%	25.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	8.1%	9.7%	8.1%	25.8%	9.7%	24.2%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	3.8%	12.8%	0.0%	16.7%	1.3%	16.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	13.5%	16.2%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	0.8%	5.6%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	6.3%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	6.2%	10.8%	9.2%	26.2%	18.5%	32.3%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	5.8%	10.7%	3.3%	18.2%	10.7%	23.1%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	6.0%	12.1%	4.0%	20.8%	4.7%	20.8%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	1.2%	9.8%	2.4%	13.4%	4.9%	15.2%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	1.8%	12.3%	0.0%	14.0%	0.0%	14.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	6.0%	10.0%	10.0%	22.0%	12.0%	24.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	6.5%	12.9%	19.4%	35.5%	6.5%	22.6%

Table 20 cont. Veterans' Report of Public Financial Support at Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Service Connected for Psychiatry %	Service Connected for Other %	Non-Service Connected Pension %	Any VA Benefit %	Social Security Disability %	Any VA or Non-VA Disability %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	2.9%	11.7%	3.9%	17.6%	5.4%	18.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	6.7%	12.2%	11.1%	26.7%	19.4%	34.4%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	7.8%	18.2%	15.6%	35.1%	9.1%	24.7%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	9.1%	22.7%	10.6%	36.4%	21.2%	37.9%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	0.0%	13.3%	6.7%	20.0%	13.3%	26.7%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	13.7%	11.8%	2.0%	27.5%	15.7%	39.2%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	8.4%	12.0%	3.6%	20.5%	2.4%	20.5%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	6.0%	15.0%	12.0%	30.0%	20.0%	33.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	5.6%	33.3%	22.2%	61.1%	5.6%	38.9%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	8.7%	4.3%	4.3%	17.4%	8.7%	17.4%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	3.2%	9.7%	1.6%	14.5%	11.3%	24.2%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	1.6%	12.4%	0.8%	14.0%	0.0%	14.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	6.7%	20.0%	1.5%	24.4%	4.4%	25.9%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	4.0%	10.0%	2.0%	14.0%	2.0%	14.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	3.1%	18.1%	2.7%	21.5%	4.2%	23.1%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	4.3%	23.9%	10.9%	39.1%	8.7%	39.1%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	4.9%	14.5%	5.2%	22.8%	8.7%	25.7%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	3.1%	23.1%	0.0%	23.1%	4.6%	26.2%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	1.4%	11.4%	2.9%	14.3%	7.1%	18.6%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	0.0%	21.7%	0.0%	21.7%	4.3%	26.1%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	13.0%	4.3%	17.4%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	4.3%	8.7%	4.3%	17.4%	4.3%	17.4%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	11.8%	17.6%	11.8%	41.2%	11.8%	29.4%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	7.7%	13.5%	3.8%	19.2%	3.8%	19.2%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	2.5%	13.1%	3.3%	18.0%	8.2%	21.3%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	3.8%	1.9%	0.0%	5.8%	5.8%	9.6%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	0.0%	3.4%	10.3%	13.8%	6.9%	13.8%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	2.9%	8.8%	2.9%	14.7%	14.7%	26.5%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	0.0%	8.0%	1.1%	9.1%	5.7%	12.5%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	2.4%	4.9%	4.9%	12.2%	0.0%	7.3%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	5.7%	31.4%	8.6%	45.7%	14.3%	45.7%
20	692	White City, OR	84	1.2%	8.3%	1.2%	10.7%	2.4%	11.9%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	20.0%	30.0%	0.0%	30.0%	10.0%	40.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	8.5%	8.5%	4.3%	19.1%	10.6%	36.2%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	8.3%	16.7%	16.7%	41.7%	33.3%	41.7%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	5.2%	10.4%	17.7%	31.3%	22.9%	38.5%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	4.3%	8.7%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%	13.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	7.9%	14.6%	2.2%	21.3%	11.2%	47.2%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	8.3%	25.0%	8.3%	41.7%	25.0%	54.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**4.8%**	**12.2%**	**4.6%**	**20.0%**	**8.8%**	**23.6%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**5.0%**	**12.3%**	**5.3%**	**21.0%**	**8.7%**	**23.6%**
SITE S.D.				**4.0%**	**6.8%**	**5.5%**	**10.3%**	**7.4%**	**11.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 21. Income Past 30 Days Before CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Mean Employment Income (month prior to admission) $	Mean Other Income†† (month prior to admission) $	Mean Total Income $
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	$70.82	$356.56	$426.34
1	523	Boston, MA	51	$9.94	$213.45	$223.39
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	$36.28	$240.21	$276.49
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	$20.38	$240.27	$260.65
1	650	Providence, RI	35	$0.00	$325.66	$325.66
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	$67.07	$375.29	$442.36
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	$29.07	$95.04	$124.11
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	$0.00	$151.08	$151.08
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	$1.93	$36.05	$37.97
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	$68.05	$332.22	$400.27
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	$38.13	$276.28	$314.42
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	$5.91	$148.88	$154.79
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	$229.76	$245.24	$475.00
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	$56.20	$46.60	$102.79
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	$37.70	$103.11	$140.82
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	$0.00	$321.09	$321.09
3	632	Northport, NY	82	$22.87	$463.25	$474.82
4	529	Butler, PA	45	$35.44	$97.71	$133.16
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	$35.36	$102.11	$137.47
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	$0.00	$64.54	$64.54
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	$41.91	$357.35	$399.26
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	$19.81	$101.55	$121.36
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	$116.67	$70.67	$187.33
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	$24.93	$139.78	$164.71
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	$12.24	$128.06	$140.30
5	688	Washington, DC	82	$6.34	$137.20	$143.54
6	558	Durham, NC	10	$63.00	$0.00	$63.00
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	$0.06	$73.63	$73.69
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	$29.17	$62.78	$89.33
6	658	Salem, VA	38	$8.16	$334.95	$343.11
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	$64.42	$89.47	$153.89
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	$17.90	$329.66	$347.56
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	$65.94	$149.64	$212.81
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	$63.08	$258.55	$321.63
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	$0.00	$13.76	$13.76
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	$1.53	$123.22	$124.75
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	$43.23	$35.04	$78.27
8	546	Miami, FL	39	$30.77	$112.49	$143.26
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	$248.31	$235.86	$484.17
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	$49.05	$334.76	$383.81
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	$48.79	$49.53	$98.32
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	$12.97	$164.73	$177.70
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	$0.00	$13.03	$13.03
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	$1.54	$255.18	$256.72
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	$61.61	$162.14	$220.02
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	$40.04	$114.28	$154.32
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	$13.70	$81.39	$95.09
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	$64.26	$55.47	$119.74
11	550	Danville, IL	50	$147.80	$226.06	$369.34
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	$56.39	$226.58	$282.97

Table 21 cont. Income Past 30 Days Before CWT/VI Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN	SITE		N	Mean Employment Income (month prior to admission) $	Mean Other Income†† (month prior to admission) $	Mean Total Income $
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	$16.02	$123.27	$139.30
12	578	Hines, IL	180	$67.00	$318.13	$383.37
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	$29.03	$278.01	$307.04
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	$14.73	$309.71	$319.74
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	$45.33	$213.67	$259.00
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	$27.76	$420.90	$448.67
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	$19.78	$163.60	$183.39
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	$0.00	$126.17	$126.17
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	$41.11	$315.68	$356.79
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	$10.00	$377.94	$387.94
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	$59.57	$209.00	$268.57
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	$0.00	$138.53	$138.53
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	$26.42	$60.37	$86.79
16	580	Houston, TX	135	$25.73	$154.01	$179.74
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	$138.00	$51.00	$189.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	$14.69	$116.05	$130.74
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	$31.74	$200.22	$231.96
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	$85.53	$149.41	$234.94
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	$6.15	$94.46	$100.62
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	$154.91	$133.00	$287.91
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	$111.48	$91.09	$202.57
17	674	Temple, TX	23	$55.09	$49.43	$104.52
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	$48.61	$117.26	$165.87
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	$0.00	$210.12	$210.12
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	$124.69	$125.33	$250.02
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	$48.11	$142.91	$190.62
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	$27.98	$57.85	$85.83
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	$33.76	$143.93	$177.69
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	$33.38	$250.32	$283.71
20	648	Portland, OR	88	$35.16	$56.76	$91.92
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	$5.15	$76.85	$82.00
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	$114.34	$451.94	$566.29
20	692	White City, OR	84	$5.36	$55.86	$61.21
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	$153.40	$326.60	$480.00
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	$34.85	$212.30	$247.15
21	654	Reno, NV	12	$18.33	$487.33	$505.67
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	$21.82	$433.71	$455.53
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	$106.57	$175.39	$281.96
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	$14.31	$396.09	$410.40
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	$16.25	$632.79	$649.04
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**$39.17**	**$175.97**	**$214.89**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**$43.79**	**$190.20**	**$233.63**
SITE S.D.				**$47.42**	**$127.83**	**$137.92**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.
†† Mean other income includes Service Connected and Non-service Connected pensions, SSDI, SSI, Social Security Retirement, other disability (e.g. workman's compensation) and any other public support (e.g. food stamps, general relief).

Table 22. Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN	SITE		N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Outdoors / Shelter %	Other %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	27.6%	10.8%	37.2%	22.1%	2.3%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	39.2%	27.5%	29.4%	3.9%	0.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	10.5%	3.5%	73.3%	12.8%	0.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	46.3%	5.1%	12.6%	29.7%	6.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	25.7%	42.9%	8.6%	20.0%	2.9%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	61.6%	8.2%	8.2%	21.9%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	40.7%	24.1%	24.1%	11.1%	0.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	16.7%	8.3%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	56.3%	28.1%	4.7%	9.4%	1.6%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	39.8%	5.3%	24.8%	28.3%	1.8%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	39.1%	13.9%	0.9%	36.5%	9.6%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	81.0%	0.0%	9.5%	9.5%	0.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	31.3%	9.9%	29.8%	25.2%	3.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	24.3%	0.0%	67.1%	8.6%	0.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	47.0%	4.5%	27.3%	21.2%	0.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	52.4%	8.5%	15.9%	20.7%	2.4%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	6.7%	0.0%	93.3%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	40.2%	1.5%	7.3%	49.8%	1.1%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	4.3%	2.2%	88.2%	3.2%	2.2%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	47.8%	26.1%	0.0%	26.1%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	30.0%	17.1%	44.7%	8.2%	0.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	41.7%	25.0%	8.3%	25.0%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	9.8%	14.6%	68.3%	7.3%	0.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	15.8%	0.5%	82.0%	1.8%	0.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	39.0%	41.5%	1.2%	18.3%	0.0%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	60.0%	0.0%	10.0%	30.0%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	3.5%	0.0%	94.2%	1.2%	1.2%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	70.8%	8.3%	12.5%	4.2%	4.2%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	50.0%	7.9%	13.2%	28.9%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	26.7%	50.8%	2.6%	18.5%	1.5%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	64.0%	16.0%	8.0%	12.0%	0.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	27.8%	63.0%	5.6%	1.9%	1.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	35.0%	53.8%	1.3%	10.0%	0.0%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	68.1%	8.3%	9.7%	12.5%	1.4%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	24.4%	21.5%	43.7%	9.6%	0.7%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	41.0%	23.1%	30.8%	5.1%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	28.6%	57.1%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	71.0%	4.8%	9.7%	12.9%	1.6%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	24.4%	38.5%	2.6%	34.6%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	54.1%	29.7%	0.0%	16.2%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	1.6%	0.0%	97.6%	0.8%	0.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	39.2%	39.2%	5.4%	16.2%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	44.6%	11.6%	27.3%	10.7%	5.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	43.6%	16.8%	31.5%	8.1%	0.0%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	28.0%	7.3%	39.6%	25.0%	0.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	49.1%	19.3%	7.0%	22.8%	1.8%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	64.0%	2.0%	6.0%	28.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	51.6%	22.6%	3.2%	22.6%	0.0%

Table 22 cont. Usual Residence in Month Prior to CWT Admission by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Outdoors / Shelter %	Other %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	41.0%	7.8%	26.8%	21.0%	3.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	63.3%	20.0%	11.1%	5.0%	0.6%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	46.8%	35.1%	13.0%	5.2%	0.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	25.8%	9.1%	65.2%	0.0%	0.0%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	13.3%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	60.8%	5.9%	19.6%	7.8%	5.9%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	6.0%	0.0%	88.0%	4.8%	1.2%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	25.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	62.0%	3.0%	26.0%	7.0%	2.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	65.2%	13.0%	8.7%	8.7%	4.3%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	14.5%	0.0%	83.9%	1.6%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	34.1%	1.6%	34.1%	30.2%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	43.3%	29.9%	0.7%	24.6%	1.5%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	38.0%	10.0%	16.0%	34.0%	2.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	7.3%	3.8%	86.5%	2.3%	0.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	54.3%	39.1%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	27.7%	4.3%	17.6%	41.0%	9.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	31.4%	10.0%	1.4%	57.1%	0.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	60.9%	34.8%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	26.1%	8.7%	43.5%	21.7%	0.0%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	43.5%	17.4%	34.8%	4.3%	0.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	47.1%	17.6%	11.8%	23.5%	0.0%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	38.5%	40.4%	0.0%	21.2%	0.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	15.6%	0.0%	76.2%	8.2%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	17.3%	76.9%	1.9%	3.8%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	69.0%	10.3%	0.0%	20.7%	0.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	32.4%	11.8%	38.2%	17.6%	0.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	19.3%	4.5%	72.7%	3.4%	0.0%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	41.5%	0.0%	24.4%	34.1%	0.0%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	62.9%	11.4%	22.9%	2.9%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	84	2.4%	0.0%	97.6%	0.0%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	6.4%	2.1%	74.5%	12.8%	4.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	33.3%	8.3%	8.3%	50.0%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	41.7%	35.4%	2.1%	20.8%	0.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	52.2%	39.1%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	37.1%	50.6%	1.1%	6.7%	4.5%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	75.0%	16.7%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**33.1%**	**14.3%**	**34.3%**	**16.7%**	**1.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**36.9%**	**16.5%**	**29.8%**	**15.5%**	**1.2%**
SITE S.D.				**19.8%**	**17.9%**	**32.3%**	**14.0%**	**2.4%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.
†† Includes own apartment, room or house; apartment, room or house of friend or family member and hotel or SRO.

Table 23. Homeless When Last in Community and Loss of a Job Due to Substance Use by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Homeless When Last Living in the Community %	Loss of a Job Due to Substance Abuse %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	57.6%	50.4%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	49.0%	72.5%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	86.0%	66.3%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	76.0%	61.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	91.4%	51.4%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	46.6%	32.9%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	68.5%	61.1%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	75.0%	50.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	75.2%	67.9%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	26.6%	59.4%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	68.1%	65.5%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	50.4%	39.1%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	28.6%	33.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	85.5%	68.7%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	72.5%	58.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	54.5%	62.1%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	52.4%	46.9%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	60.0%	68.9%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	85.8%	62.8%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	72.3%	72.3%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	73.9%	82.6%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	44.1%	60.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	50.0%	66.7%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	90.2%	82.9%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	72.1%	53.6%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	20.7%	54.9%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	30.0%	70.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	70.9%	48.8%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	62.5%	82.6%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	52.6%	39.5%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	77.4%	70.3%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	48.0%	40.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	66.7%	59.3%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	48.8%	41.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	100.0%	38.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	30.6%	50.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	57.0%	49.6%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	66.7%	51.3%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	14.3%	45.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	35.5%	74.2%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	65.4%	29.5%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	32.4%	59.5%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	68.3%	54.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	73.8%	88.5%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	55.4%	49.6%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	87.2%	75.2%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	76.2%	55.5%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	49.1%	77.2%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	60.0%	50.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	32.3%	32.3%

Table 23 cont. Homeless When Last in Community and Loss of a Job Due to Substance Use by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Homeless When Last Living in the Community %	Loss of a Job Due to Substance Abuse %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	46.8%	70.2%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	31.1%	54.4%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	32.5%	54.5%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	54.5%	60.6%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	86.7%	66.7%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	43.1%	62.7%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	71.1%	68.7%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	66.7%	58.3%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	44.0%	69.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	22.2%	55.6%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	30.4%	47.8%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	25.8%	85.5%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	87.6%	35.4%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	66.7%	36.3%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	48.0%	54.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	24.6%	60.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	63.0%	56.5%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	70.8%	68.1%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	78.5%	73.8%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	85.5%	44.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	47.8%	30.4%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	52.2%	43.5%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	27.3%	13.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	64.7%	52.9%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	42.3%	36.5%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	66.4%	48.4%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	67.3%	78.8%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	31.0%	46.4%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	73.5%	64.7%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	59.1%	67.0%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	61.0%	65.9%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	28.6%	48.6%
20	692	White City, OR	84	81.0%	59.5%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	60.0%	20.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	87.2%	70.2%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	41.7%	50.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	70.8%	53.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	60.6%	58.4%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	47.8%	34.8%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	47.2%	79.8%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				60.6%	58.4%
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				57.7%	56.6%
SITE S.D.				19.7%	15.0%

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 24. Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Abuse/ Dependency %	Drug Abuse/ Dependency %	Any Substance Abuse / Dependency %	Serious Mental Illness†† %	Dually Diagnosed††† %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	69.2%	38.4%	76.5%	55.8%	42.2%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	82.4%	56.9%	92.2%	60.8%	52.9%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	87.2%	53.5%	94.2%	46.5%	43.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	78.3%	41.7%	85.1%	40.0%	32.6%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	77.1%	31.4%	80.0%	65.7%	54.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	46.6%	31.5%	56.2%	68.5%	31.5%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	79.6%	70.4%	88.9%	38.9%	33.3%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	58.3%	54.2%	75.0%	54.2%	33.3%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	84.4%	67.9%	98.2%	36.7%	36.7%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	68.8%	63.5%	84.4%	48.4%	34.4%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	73.5%	61.9%	86.7%	42.5%	36.3%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	60.0%	80.9%	93.0%	33.9%	31.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	66.7%	90.5%	95.2%	23.8%	23.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	66.9%	75.2%	96.9%	24.6%	23.1%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	83.8%	66.9%	92.3%	39.4%	34.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	69.7%	84.8%	93.9%	33.3%	28.8%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	46.3%	31.7%	56.1%	48.8%	20.7%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	86.7%	64.4%	93.3%	28.9%	26.7%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	85.1%	79.3%	97.3%	**21.5%**	19.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	87.2%	81.9%	98.9%	**20.2%**	20.2%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	87.0%	78.3%	87.0%	47.8%	34.8%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	80.6%	66.5%	88.8%	28.8%	22.9%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	58.3%	91.7%	91.7%	33.3%	25.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	70.7%	68.3%	90.2%	43.9%	34.1%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	86.0%	71.2%	91.4%	36.9%	32.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	43.9%	76.8%	91.5%	41.5%	32.9%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	60.0%	60.0%	80.0%	**10.0%**	10.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	83.7%	83.7%	96.5%	36.0%	33.7%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	95.8%	54.2%	95.8%	**16.7%**	12.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	73.7%	60.5%	84.2%	34.2%	28.9%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	80.5%	83.1%	97.9%	32.3%	30.3%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	60.0%	44.0%	76.0%	42.0%	22.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	74.1%	70.4%	83.3%	37.0%	24.1%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	83.8%	55.0%	86.3%	43.8%	33.8%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	61.9%	38.1%	71.4%	66.7%	38.1%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	69.4%	54.2%	83.3%	26.4%	18.1%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	76.3%	30.4%	83.0%	**17.0%**	11.1%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	64.1%	71.8%	84.6%	48.7%	43.6%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	74.3%	31.4%	82.9%	37.1%	25.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	82.3%	59.7%	91.9%	40.3%	33.9%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	82.1%	51.3%	88.5%	26.9%	21.8%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	83.8%	62.2%	94.6%	**18.9%**	13.5%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	84.1%	45.2%	87.3%	**23.0%**	15.9%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	93.8%	67.7%	96.9%	28.5%	26.2%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	75.2%	53.7%	79.3%	43.0%	24.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	91.9%	73.8%	92.6%	32.2%	30.9%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	87.8%	72.0%	93.9%	26.8%	24.4%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	87.7%	57.9%	98.2%	42.1%	40.4%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	68.0%	42.0%	76.0%	36.0%	16.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	54.8%	41.9%	71.0%	51.6%	35.5%

Table 24 cont. Clinical Psychiatric Diagnoses by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Abuse/ Dependency %	Drug Abuse/ Dependency %	Any Substance Abuse / Dependency %	Serious Mental Illness†† %	Dually Diagnosed††† %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	80.5%	80.5%	98.0%	24.9%	23.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	58.9%	56.7%	74.4%	46.1%	29.4%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	77.9%	40.3%	83.1%	42.9%	37.7%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	78.8%	57.6%	83.3%	47.0%	39.4%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	86.7%	46.7%	93.3%	33.3%	33.3%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	86.3%	21.6%	88.2%	41.2%	33.3%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	91.6%	32.5%	95.2%	30.1%	27.7%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	83.3%	75.0%	100.0%	**16.7%**	16.7%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	85.0%	52.0%	92.0%	46.0%	42.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	72.2%	55.6%	77.8%	66.7%	55.6%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	82.6%	47.8%	91.3%	30.4%	26.1%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	88.7%	75.8%	88.7%	41.9%	40.3%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	69.8%	51.9%	81.4%	**11.6%**	6.2%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	48.9%	45.2%	63.0%	36.3%	21.5%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	76.0%	70.0%	88.0%	**12.0%**	8.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	81.2%	72.7%	96.2%	24.2%	21.2%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	69.6%	34.8%	82.6%	34.8%	28.3%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	73.1%	73.7%	87.9%	35.8%	27.5%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	80.0%	57.8%	93.8%	26.2%	21.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	74.3%	52.9%	81.4%	31.4%	20.0%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	21.7%	30.4%	43.5%	39.1%	4.3%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	52.2%	30.4%	56.5%	39.1%	21.7%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	43.5%	43.5%	65.2%	**21.7%**	13.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	70.6%	35.3%	82.4%	58.8%	47.1%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	51.9%	40.4%	65.4%	44.2%	26.9%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	67.2%	39.3%	77.9%	**21.3%**	17.2%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	90.4%	55.8%	94.2%	40.4%	36.5%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	62.1%	44.8%	72.4%	48.3%	31.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	76.5%	44.1%	85.3%	29.4%	26.5%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	72.7%	67.0%	85.2%	51.1%	45.5%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	73.2%	46.3%	78.0%	53.7%	36.6%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	51.4%	40.0%	60.0%	40.0%	17.1%
20	692	White City, OR	84	84.5%	64.3%	91.7%	28.6%	27.4%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	30.0%	30.0%	40.0%	60.0%	20.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	72.3%	76.6%	91.5%	29.8%	25.5%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	66.7%	50.0%	66.7%	83.3%	50.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	62.5%	70.8%	91.7%	42.7%	37.5%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	69.6%	65.2%	78.3%	**13.0%**	8.7%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	86.5%	85.4%	98.9%	38.2%	37.1%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	41.7%	29.2%	50.0%	66.7%	29.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**75.4%**	**60.4%**	**86.9%**	**35.8%**	**28.4%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**72.5%**	**57.0%**	**84.1%**	**37.9%**	**28.6%**
SITE S.D.				**14.5%**	**17.0%**	**12.7%**	**14.1%**	**10.7%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.
†† Serious mental illness is defined as having a psychiatric diagnosis that falls into one of the following categories: schizophrenia, psychotic disorder (other than schizophrenia), mood disorder and PTSD.
††† Dual Diagnosis is defined as having both a substance abuse disorder and a serious psychiatric disorder.

Table 25. Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY01.†

VISN	SITE		N	Any Psychiatric Disorder†† %	Any Disabling Medical Condition %	Any Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	95.3%	61.9%	99.7%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	100.0%	31.4%	100.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	100.0%	62.8%	100.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	96.6%	58.9%	100.0%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	97.1%	88.6%	100.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	100.0%	57.5%	100.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	100.0%	53.7%	100.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	99.1%	63.3%	100.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	98.4%	42.2%	100.0%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	94.7%	74.3%	100.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	98.3%	48.7%	100.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	95.2%	57.1%	100.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	99.2%	35.1%	100.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	98.6%	43.7%	100.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	100.0%	27.3%	100.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	86.6%	46.3%	96.3%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	95.6%	55.6%	100.0%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	99.6%	33.3%	100.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	100.0%	40.4%	100.0%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	100.0%	21.7%	100.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	97.1%	39.4%	100.0%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	100.0%	63.4%	100.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	99.5%	40.1%	100.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	100.0%	37.8%	100.0%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	80.0%	80.0%	100.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	100.0%	69.8%	100.0%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	100.0%	29.2%	100.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	92.1%	36.8%	97.4%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	100.0%	70.3%	100.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	96.0%	78.0%	100.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	98.1%	44.4%	100.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	96.3%	52.5%	98.8%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	97.2%	31.9%	100.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	93.3%	45.2%	99.3%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	94.9%	71.8%	100.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	94.3%	60.0%	100.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	98.4%	48.4%	100.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	96.2%	51.3%	100.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	100.0%	27.0%	100.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	99.2%	57.9%	100.0%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	100.0%	61.5%	100.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	97.5%	24.8%	99.2%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	96.0%	61.7%	99.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	98.2%	26.8%	100.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	100.0%	56.1%	100.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	96.0%	28.0%	98.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	96.8%	67.7%	96.8%

Table 25 cont. Presence of a Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Any Psychiatric Disorder†† %	Any Disabling Medical Condition %	Any Psychiatric Disorder or Disabling Medical Condition %
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	205	99.5%	35.1%	100.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	180	94.4%	59.4%	98.9%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	77	92.2%	64.9%	100.0%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	66	92.4%	68.2%	100.0%
13	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**	15	93.3%	46.7%	100.0%
13	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	51	100.0%	78.4%	100.0%
13	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	83	97.6%	66.3%	100.0%
13	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	12	100.0%	8.3%	100.0%
13	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	100	98.0%	64.0%	100.0%
14	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	18	100.0%	44.4%	100.0%
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	23	100.0%	21.7%	100.0%
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	62	90.3%	64.5%	100.0%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	129	88.4%	37.2%	97.7%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	135	83.7%	52.6%	100.0%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	50	94.0%	38.0%	98.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	260	99.6%	16.9%	100.0%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	46	93.5%	78.3%	100.0%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	346	96.8%	61.3%	100.0%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	65	98.5%	47.7%	100.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	70	95.7%	42.9%	98.6%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	23	82.6%	56.5%	100.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	23	78.3%	47.8%	100.0%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	23	91.3%	21.7%	100.0%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	17	94.1%	23.5%	94.1%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	52	94.2%	67.3%	100.0%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	122	85.2%	82.0%	100.0%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	98.1%	42.3%	100.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	29	93.1%	41.4%	100.0%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	34	88.2%	50.0%	94.1%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	88	95.5%	68.2%	100.0%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	41	97.6%	41.5%	97.6%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	35	88.6%	62.9%	100.0%
20	692	**White City, OR**	84	96.4%	78.6%	100.0%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	10	100.0%	60.0%	100.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	47	97.9%	55.3%	100.0%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	100.0%	75.0%	100.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	96	96.9%	75.0%	100.0%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	23	91.3%	17.4%	100.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	89	100.0%	57.3%	100.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	24	87.5%	79.2%	100.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**96.5%**	**51.1%**	**99.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**96.0%**	**51.2%**	**99.6%**
SITE S.D.				**4.8%**	**18.5%**	**1.1%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

†† Includes substance abuse disorders.

Table 26. Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Ever Hospitalized for Alcohol Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Drug Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Psychiatric Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Any Mental Health Problem %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	69.5%	38.1%	45.9%	88.7%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	76.5%	52.9%	45.1%	92.2%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	83.7%	46.5%	37.2%	96.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	77.7%	37.7%	51.4%	93.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	77.1%	34.3%	71.4%	94.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	58.9%	30.1%	54.8%	86.3%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	81.5%	66.7%	33.3%	92.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	66.7%	58.3%	33.3%	83.3%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	67.0%	50.5%	28.4%	77.1%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	71.9%	60.9%	39.1%	85.9%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	61.9%	41.6%	38.1%	77.9%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	40.0%	47.8%	16.5%	64.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	71.4%	95.2%	28.6%	95.2%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	57.3%	67.9%	33.6%	87.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	84.5%	72.5%	31.7%	96.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	80.3%	74.2%	59.1%	95.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	57.3%	42.7%	52.4%	78.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	88.9%	64.4%	62.2%	97.8%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	49.4%	58.2%	27.2%	74.3%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	71.3%	67.0%	36.2%	89.4%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	56.5%	60.9%	43.5%	73.9%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	78.2%	63.5%	54.1%	92.4%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	58.3%	50.0%	33.3%	83.3%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	63.4%	68.3%	46.3%	95.1%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	73.4%	64.9%	50.0%	89.2%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	39.0%	52.4%	43.9%	70.7%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	50.0%	50.0%	10.0%	60.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	86.0%	83.7%	45.3%	98.8%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	95.8%	58.3%	29.2%	95.8%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	76.3%	60.5%	42.1%	92.1%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	53.3%	56.4%	28.2%	69.7%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	64.0%	38.0%	54.0%	88.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	55.6%	46.3%	35.2%	72.2%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	51.3%	30.0%	36.3%	68.8%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	57.1%	66.7%	42.9%	76.2%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	63.9%	37.5%	29.2%	75.0%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	73.3%	35.6%	27.4%	85.2%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	59.0%	64.1%	38.5%	84.6%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	62.9%	31.4%	45.7%	80.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	87.1%	53.2%	32.3%	91.9%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	35.9%	20.5%	19.2%	47.4%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	91.9%	67.6%	35.1%	100.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	75.4%	42.1%	31.0%	86.5%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	95.4%	69.2%	50.8%	100.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	78.5%	62.8%	60.3%	95.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	90.6%	74.5%	40.9%	92.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	78.7%	68.9%	47.0%	90.9%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	75.4%	56.1%	43.9%	93.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	74.0%	42.0%	58.0%	88.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	25.8%	16.1%	35.5%	58.1%

Table 26 cont. Self-Reported Lifetime Hospitalizations for Mental Health Problems by Site for FY01.

VISN		SITE	N	Ever Hospitalized for Alcohol Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Drug Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Psychiatric Problems %	Ever Hospitalized for Any Mental Health Problem %
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	205	79.0%	82.0%	30.7%	100.0%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	180	65.0%	66.1%	57.8%	92.8%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	77	77.9%	41.6%	53.2%	89.6%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	66	68.2%	53.0%	51.5%	84.8%
13	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**	15	86.7%	33.3%	73.3%	100.0%
13	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	51	76.5%	17.6%	43.1%	86.3%
13	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	83	91.6%	32.5%	44.6%	100.0%
13	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	12	91.7%	75.0%	16.7%	100.0%
13	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	100	84.0%	55.0%	50.0%	94.0%
14	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	18	77.8%	44.4%	94.4%	100.0%
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	23	73.9%	43.5%	56.5%	95.7%
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	62	96.8%	83.9%	67.7%	96.8%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	129	65.1%	46.5%	27.1%	83.7%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	135	40.7%	34.8%	34.1%	60.7%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	50	74.0%	64.0%	26.0%	86.0%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	260	83.1%	72.7%	38.5%	97.3%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	46	52.2%	26.1%	43.5%	73.9%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	346	59.5%	64.5%	42.2%	81.2%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	65	83.1%	67.7%	41.5%	100.0%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	70	41.4%	34.3%	25.7%	67.1%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	23	21.7%	26.1%	34.8%	60.9%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	23	69.6%	43.5%	39.1%	87.0%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	23	43.5%	34.8%	17.4%	56.5%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	17	47.1%	23.5%	47.1%	70.6%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	52	50.0%	26.9%	44.2%	67.3%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	122	64.8%	36.1%	34.4%	82.8%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	86.5%	51.9%	57.7%	92.3%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	29	55.2%	58.6%	48.3%	86.2%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	34	70.6%	38.2%	32.4%	79.4%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	88	69.3%	70.5%	56.8%	94.3%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	41	63.4%	34.1%	51.2%	75.6%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	35	45.7%	42.9%	28.6%	62.9%
20	692	**White City, OR**	84	70.2%	54.8%	38.1%	86.9%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	10	10.0%	10.0%	30.0%	40.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	47	72.3%	68.1%	40.4%	95.7%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	66.7%	50.0%	66.7%	75.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	96	47.9%	52.1%	41.7%	78.1%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	23	60.9%	65.2%	26.1%	78.3%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	89	61.8%	55.1%	36.0%	77.5%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	24	37.5%	16.7%	54.2%	62.5%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**68.3%**	**54.2%**	**41.1%**	**85.4%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**66.7%**	**51.1%**	**41.8%**	**83.8%**
SITE S.D.				**17.2%**	**17.4%**	**13.7%**	**13.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 27. Mode of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY01.†

VISN	SITE		N	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Left Before Planned Discharge %	Other†† %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	**31.4%**	11.6%	50.9%	6.1%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	62.7%	17.6%	9.8%	9.8%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	55.8%	18.6%	25.6%	0.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	52.6%	24.6%	17.7%	5.1%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	74.3%	14.3%	11.4%	0.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	72.6%	11.0%	6.8%	9.6%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	37.0%	**33.3%**	25.9%	3.7%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	66.7%	25.0%	4.2%	4.2%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	84.4%	9.2%	6.4%	0.0%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	42.2%	20.3%	34.4%	3.1%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	63.7%	10.6%	21.2%	4.4%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	63.5%	17.4%	7.8%	11.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	66.7%	14.3%	14.3%	4.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	51.9%	**30.5%**	16.8%	0.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	45.1%	15.5%	38.0%	1.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	39.4%	22.7%	37.9%	0.0%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	43.9%	3.7%	41.5%	11.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	86.7%	8.9%	2.2%	2.2%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	60.0%	13.8%	25.0%	1.2%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	59.6%	26.6%	11.7%	2.1%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	60.9%	26.1%	13.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	57.6%	15.3%	24.1%	2.9%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	58.3%	8.3%	25.0%	8.3%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	58.5%	0.0%	26.8%	14.6%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	56.8%	9.9%	19.4%	14.0%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	50.0%	**37.8%**	8.5%	3.7%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	67.4%	15.1%	11.6%	5.8%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	50.0%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	60.5%	23.7%	13.2%	2.6%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	45.1%	23.6%	27.2%	4.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	62.0%	18.0%	12.0%	8.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	74.1%	1.9%	22.2%	1.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	**33.8%**	25.0%	35.0%	6.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	**19.0%**	23.8%	57.1%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	40.3%	**33.3%**	22.2%	4.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	41.5%	16.3%	29.6%	12.6%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	56.4%	15.4%	25.6%	2.6%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	71.4%	0.0%	11.4%	17.1%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	64.5%	25.8%	8.1%	1.6%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	55.1%	0.0%	44.9%	0.0%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	54.1%	18.9%	21.6%	5.4%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	**34.1%**	19.8%	38.1%	7.9%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	**27.7%**	27.7%	37.7%	6.9%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	75.2%	9.1%	9.9%	5.8%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	87.9%	3.4%	7.4%	1.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	51.2%	**31.1%**	15.2%	100.0%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	40.4%	17.5%	36.8%	100.0%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	40.0%	26.0%	34.0%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	35.5%	19.4%	32.3%	12.9%

Table 27 cont. Mode of Discharge from CWT/VI by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Mutually Agreed/Planned Discharge %	Failure to Comply with Program Requirements %	Left Before Planned Discharge %	Other†† %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	65.9%	16.6%	14.1%	3.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	42.2%	15.0%	31.7%	11.1%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	53.2%	**37.7%**	3.9%	5.2%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	39.4%	27.3%	27.3%	6.1%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	**20.0%**	20.0%	46.7%	13.3%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	74.5%	7.8%	7.8%	9.8%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	**28.9%**	15.7%	48.2%	7.2%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	58.3%	8.3%	33.3%	0.0%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	52.0%	9.0%	32.0%	7.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	72.2%	0.0%	27.8%	0.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	**30.4%**	26.1%	43.5%	0.0%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	45.2%	**29.0%**	14.5%	11.3%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	38.8%	9.3%	45.7%	6.2%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	78.5%	0.7%	16.3%	4.4%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	40.0%	**44.0%**	12.0%	4.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	50.4%	21.9%	25.8%	1.9%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	**32.6%**	8.7%	52.2%	6.5%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	**29.5%**	15.0%	50.3%	5.2%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	73.8%	16.9%	7.7%	1.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	57.1%	18.6%	21.4%	2.9%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	**30.4%**	8.7%	30.4%	30.4%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	34.8%	17.4%	43.5%	4.3%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	52.2%	21.7%	21.7%	4.3%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	35.3%	5.9%	52.9%	5.9%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	65.4%	17.3%	13.5%	3.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	73.8%	18.0%	7.4%	0.8%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	**30.8%**	26.9%	32.7%	9.6%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	58.6%	6.9%	27.6%	6.9%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	**17.6%**	**50.0%**	29.4%	2.9%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	51.1%	26.1%	13.6%	9.1%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	**19.5%**	**51.2%**	24.4%	4.9%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	60.0%	17.1%	17.1%	5.7%
20	692	White City, OR	84	53.6%	6.0%	36.9%	3.6%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	**30.0%**	0.0%	40.0%	30.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	51.1%	14.9%	29.8%	4.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	**8.3%**	0.0%	91.7%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	**33.3%**	12.5%	43.8%	10.4%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	91.3%	0.0%	4.3%	4.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	39.3%	20.2%	34.8%	5.6%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	58.3%	12.5%	4.2%	25.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**51.4%**	**17.3%**	**25.9%**	**5.4%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**51.4%**	**17.3%**	**25.4%**	**8.0%**
SITE S.D.				**17.2%**	**10.7%**	**15.4%**	**15.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

†† Veteran became too ill to work in CWT/VI or other unspecified reason for discharge.

Table 28. Hours and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Average Total Hours Worked in CWT/VI	Average Total Earnings in CWT/VI	Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week	Average Mean Weekly Earnings in CWT/VI	Average Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI††
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	726.5	$5,315.54	19.1	$147.27	$7.28
1	523	Boston, MA	51	945.4	$7,404.78	31.6	$246.75	$7.64
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	244.6	$1,797.34	16.9	$126.95	$7.22
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	442.6	$2,195.21	20.9	$107.31	$5.15
1	650	Providence, RI	35	276.2	$1,658.11	9.2	$55.96	$6.10
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	711.8	$4,385.86	18.5	$98.73	$5.70
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	876.4	$4,595.19	33.2	$200.78	$5.31
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	440.1	$2,310.04	22.8	$120.67	$5.20
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	379.2	$1,954.51	35.4	$187.06	$5.17
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	528.3	$2,848.73	33.2	$181.49	$5.33
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	580.8	$3,218.13	24.9	$137.21	$5.09
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	635.7	$4,062.96	35.2	$231.73	$6.46
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	966.3	$5,807.29	26.0	$159.27	$6.10
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	148.3	$822.22	32.8	$195.91	$5.57
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	475.2	$2,874.54	30.1	$192.23	$6.03
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	454.2	$2,539.53	23.5	$132.70	$5.56
3	632	Northport, NY	82	248.2	$802.57	17.5	$196.66	$2.97
4	529	Butler, PA	45	237.4	$1,238.36	20.2	$105.08	$5.14
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	313.1	$1,806.67	27.9	$155.14	$5.37
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	548.9	$3,193.37	36.2	$215.72	$5.83
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	1307.1	$7,899.30	33.8	$211.34	$6.15
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	409.8	$2,156.67	29.6	$160.83	$5.09
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	596.4	$2,854.25	25.5	$123.31	$4.78
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	368.7	$1,712.46	25.8	$122.40	$4.66
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	318.7	$1,688.76	30.0	$165.54	$5.30
5	688	Washington, DC	82	1417.7	$9,091.41	32.0	$199.61	$6.16
6	558	Durham, NC	10	458.1	$2,544.60	31.5	$175.61	$5.51
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	749.0	$4,073.59	30.9	$152.94	$4.84
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	620.3	$3,251.29	30.2	$164.36	$5.26
6	658	Salem, VA	38	492.3	$2,953.00	27.5	$171.25	$6.00
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	813.1	$4,372.85	32.1	$173.62	$5.35
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	292.9	$1,688.72	14.0	$94.86	$6.83
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	873.3	$4,776.74	26.6	$151.10	$5.56
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	555.3	$2,932.05	23.0	$132.21	$5.80
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	381.3	$1,996.43	38.6	$209.69	$5.24
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	790.4	$4,189.67	35.9	$196.29	$5.10
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	614.7	$3,240.36	30.1	$161.12	$5.24
8	546	Miami, FL	39	684.4	$3,892.41	33.0	$184.96	$5.41
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	647.3	$3,430.77	36.3	$193.14	$5.24
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	379.2	$2,100.66	22.3	$135.27	$5.98
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	600.7	$3,150.65	34.7	$186.49	$5.21
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	482.8	$2,435.22	28.6	$148.02	$5.08
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	619.4	$3,217.25	30.5	$161.50	$5.21
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	503.0	$2,942.92	28.0	$166.85	$5.79
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	152.4	$809.99	14.8	$81.88	$5.22
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	56.8	$381.30	4.9	$33.35	$7.03
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	632.2	$3,582.79	28.1	$159.70	$5.72
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	381.5	$2,872.39	25.5	$194.96	$7.38
11	550	Danville, IL	50	513.0	$2,768.60	33.9	$184.77	$5.26
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	1785.3	$9,969.29	31.7	$174.17	$5.41

Table 28 cont. Hours and Earnings in CWT/VI by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Average Total Hours Worked in CWT/VI	Average Total Earnings in CWT/VI	Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week	Average Mean Weekly Earnings in CWT/VI	Average Mean Hourly Wage in CWT/VI††
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	271.4	$1,660.02	23.1	$143.75	$5.60
12	578	Hines, IL	180	534.9	$2,982.31	**16.9**	$94.93	$5.85
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	373.1	$2,741.27	22.5	$162.44	$6.58
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	987.3	$6,338.58	21.0	$175.67	$8.42
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	225.3	$1,373.60	26.1	$162.23	$6.07
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	620.8	$3,625.45	26.4	$167.43	$5.93
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	458.6	$2,860.05	35.5	$231.31	$6.09
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	1197.1	$6,415.92	35.0	$190.92	$5.34
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	184.6	$757.91	**15.3**	$66.57	**$3.57**
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	230.9	$1,212.56	**17.1**	$91.72	$5.17
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	302.4	$1,558.04	22.3	$102.78	$4.89
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	479.4	$2,523.61	32.6	$182.84	$5.26
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	278.9	$1,620.78	26.5	$159.60	$5.79
16	580	Houston, TX	135	253.0	$1,374.50	18.7	$110.28	$5.16
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	650.6	$3,922.76	38.5	$239.46	$6.03
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	386.4	$2,201.88	37.2	$220.47	$5.48
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	126.6	$727.50	**14.1**	$80.52	$5.66
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	412.9	$2,361.51	19.9	$110.46	$5.04
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	567.4	$2,926.11	35.3	$192.27	$5.16
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	383.2	$2,274.59	**16.1**	$88.44	$4.93
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	826.3	$4,471.78	33.7	$191.66	$5.40
17	674	Temple, TX	23	88.5	$400.70	**8.8**	$40.47	$5.47
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	91.4	$500.04	**8.9**	$43.30	$6.18
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	316.4	$1,789.94	33.4	$219.16	$5.82
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	393.5	$2,137.38	31.4	$179.08	$5.50
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	243.5	$1,564.93	24.3	$160.41	$6.14
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	681.0	$3,876.25	36.1	$208.81	$5.85
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	511.9	$2,840.55	25.9	$145.17	$5.44
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	625.0	$3,914.41	34.1	$211.90	$6.11
20	648	Portland, OR	88	538.1	$3,690.06	31.2	$217.47	$6.84
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	558.6	$3,659.78	32.7	$222.03	$6.52
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	343.0	$2,117.06	**17.6**	$114.37	$6.27
20	692	White City, OR	84	357.8	$2,045.81	22.0	$125.75	$5.67
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	188.9	$1,136.80	**12.2**	$73.98	$6.08
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	657.8	$6,196.72	31.9	$318.48	$9.36
21	654	Reno, NV	12	157.6	$682.25	**7.0**	$27.27	$5.19
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	338.4	$2,248.00	**14.2**	$115.58	$7.27
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	583.4	$3,132.78	36.5	$206.59	$5.38
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	760.8	$4,489.26	23.5	$139.68	$5.89
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	1004.8	$6,026.13	26.3	$162.16	$6.05
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**489.6**	**$2,872.45**	**25.9**	**$154.81**	**$5.72**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**520.8**	**$3,024.30**	**26.2**	**$156.26**	**$5.73**
SITE S.D.				**295.5**	**$1,831.46**	**8.1**	**$52.49**	**$0.86**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 29. Location of CWT/VI Participation by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	VA and/or Community Workshop Only %	VA and/or Community Supported Employment / Transitional Work Experience Only %	Any Workshop Placement %	Any Supported Employment / Transitional Work Experience Placement %
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	344	20.6%	55.5%	44.5%	79.4%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	51	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	86	4.7%	90.7%	9.3%	95.3%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	175	35.4%	0.0%	100.0%	64.6%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	35	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	73	75.3%	11.0%	89.0%	24.7%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	54	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	24	4.2%	83.3%	16.7%	95.8%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	109	18.3%	78.0%	22.0%	81.7%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	64	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	38.9%	1.8%	98.2%	61.1%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	115	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	21	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%	100.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	131	14.5%	77.1%	18.3%	80.9%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	142	0.7%	81.7%	18.3%	99.3%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	66	9.1%	83.3%	15.2%	89.4%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	82	98.8%	1.2%	98.8%	1.2%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	261	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	94	9.6%	64.9%	35.1%	90.4%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	23	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	170	47.1%	0.0%	100.0%	52.9%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	12	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	41	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	222	1.4%	86.9%	12.6%	98.2%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	82	13.4%	85.4%	14.6%	86.6%
6	558	**Durham, NC**	10	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	86	32.6%	47.7%	52.3%	67.4%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	38	15.8%	76.3%	23.7%	84.2%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	195	0.5%	38.5%	61.5%	99.5%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	50	96.0%	2.0%	98.0%	4.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	54	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	80	0.0%	97.5%	2.5%	100.0%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	21	0.0%	95.2%	4.8%	100.0%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	72	18.1%	43.1%	56.9%	81.9%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	135	0.7%	99.3%	0.7%	99.3%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	39	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	35	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	78	5.1%	73.1%	16.7%	84.6%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	37	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	126	4.0%	81.7%	18.3%	96.0%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	130	0.0%	97.7%	1.5%	99.2%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	121	77.7%	2.5%	97.5%	22.3%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	149	0.0%	97.3%	2.7%	100.0%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	164	35.4%	56.1%	43.9%	64.6%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	57	47.4%	0.0%	100.0%	52.6%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	50	0.0%	98.0%	2.0%	100.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	31	6.5%	93.5%	6.5%	93.5%

Table 29 cont. Location of CWT/VI Participation by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	VA and/or Community Workshop Only %	VA and/or Community Supported Employment / Transitional Work Experience Only %	Any Workshop Placement %	Any Supported Employment / Transitional Work Experience Placement %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	1.0%	99.0%	1.0%	99.0%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	31.1%	0.6%	99.4%	68.9%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	37.7%	49.4%	50.6%	62.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	39.4%	43.9%	56.1%	60.6%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	15.7%	35.3%	52.9%	72.5%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	53.0%	3.0%	97.0%	47.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	50.0%	16.7%	83.3%	50.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	78.3%	0.0%	100.0%	21.7%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	0.0%	72.9%	0.0%	72.9%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	43.7%	1.5%	97.0%	54.8%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	67.4%	0.0%	100.0%	32.6%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	62.1%	0.0%	100.0%	37.9%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	0.0%	95.4%	3.1%	98.5%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	98.6%	0.0%	100.0%	1.4%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	95.7%	0.0%	100.0%	4.3%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	4.9%	94.3%	5.7%	95.1%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	0.0%	94.2%	0.0%	94.2%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	0.0%	96.6%	3.4%	100.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	14.7%	55.9%	44.1%	85.3%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	17.1%	70.7%	26.8%	80.5%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	20.0%	60.0%	34.3%	74.3%
20	692	White City, OR	84	36.9%	61.9%	38.1%	63.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	10.0%	90.0%	10.0%	90.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	6.4%	91.5%	8.5%	93.6%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	43.8%	1.0%	99.0%	56.3%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	8.7%	91.3%	8.7%	91.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**20.4%**	**61.7%**	**37.4%**	**78.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**19.6%**	**67.1%**	**32.1%**	**79.5%**
SITE S.D.				**29.2%**	**39.2%**	**39.3%**	**29.1%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 30. Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas Among Veterans with a Problem in That Area by Site for FY01.†, ††

VISN		SITE	N	WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS						
				Average Work Improvement	Personal Appearance/ Hygiene	Attendance/ Punctuality	Acceptance of Supervision	Ability to Get Along with Co-workers	Productivity	Quality of Production
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	1.16	21.5%	22.2%	22.4%	23.5%	26.5%	26.8%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	1.44	35.3%	54.9%	51.0%	47.1%	51.0%	51.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	1.18	21.4%	25.9%	23.3%	23.3%	36.0%	39.5%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	1.81	86.9%	85.1%	84.0%	83.4%	84.0%	83.4%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	1.81	94.3%	82.9%	97.1%	88.6%	85.7%	94.3%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	1.63	58.6%	67.1%	71.2%	74.0%	68.5%	83.6%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	1.18	44.4%	37.0%	46.3%	44.4%	40.7%	38.9%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	1.62	69.6%	79.2%	79.2%	79.2%	79.2%	79.2%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	1.87	90.8%	87.2%	87.2%	85.3%	85.3%	85.3%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	1.17	25.4%	29.7%	32.8%	32.8%	37.5%	36.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	1.48	64.6%	53.1%	55.8%	56.6%	59.3%	58.4%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	1.67	73.6%	76.5%	79.1%	75.7%	76.5%	78.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	1.92	95.2%	95.2%	90.5%	90.5%	95.2%	95.2%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	1.95	95.0%	96.2%	96.2%	94.7%	95.4%	94.7%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	1.23	22.0%	31.4%	29.8%	29.7%	30.5%	30.5%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	1.21	39.1%	30.3%	39.4%	45.5%	37.9%	38.5%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	1.35	32.9%	35.4%	35.4%	36.6%	36.6%	32.9%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	1.91	93.3%	91.1%	93.3%	93.3%	93.3%	93.3%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	1.87	93.5%	87.7%	88.9%	88.1%	87.4%	87.4%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	1.88	96.8%	84.0%	81.9%	89.4%	92.6%	92.6%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	1.99	100.0%	95.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	1.80	75.9%	72.9%	90.0%	92.4%	89.4%	89.4%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	1.90	90.9%	83.3%	91.7%	100.0%	91.7%	91.7%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	1.55	46.3%	57.5%	58.5%	56.1%	62.1%	58.1%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	1.83	87.8%	83.3%	87.4%	86.9%	83.8%	84.2%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	1.46	68.8%	57.3%	64.6%	59.8%	52.4%	52.4%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	1.90	100.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	100.0%	100.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	1.88	89.0%	89.5%	90.7%	89.5%	90.7%	90.7%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	1.60	62.5%	66.7%	62.5%	62.5%	62.5%	62.5%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	1.93	100.0%	89.5%	97.4%	97.4%	86.8%	89.5%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	1.31	98.5%	60.0%	57.9%	58.5%	57.4%	58.5%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	1.67	48.0%	62.0%	72.0%	64.0%	84.0%	79.6%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	1.87	94.4%	87.0%	85.2%	85.2%	83.3%	87.0%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	1.66	72.5%	60.0%	68.8%	68.8%	73.8%	71.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	1.39	42.9%	61.9%	28.6%	28.6%	57.1%	33.3%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	1.73	91.8%	76.4%	86.1%	86.1%	80.6%	86.1%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	1.59	59.3%	59.3%	74.1%	73.3%	60.0%	60.0%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	1.62	74.4%	53.8%	66.7%	66.7%	59.0%	59.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	1.52	62.9%	62.9%	62.9%	60.0%	54.3%	57.1%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	1.75	75.8%	80.6%	75.8%	72.6%	60.0%	75.4%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	1.17	22.2%	16.4%	17.9%	20.8%	47.4%	44.2%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	1.68	70.3%	64.9%	67.6%	67.6%	67.6%	67.6%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	1.90	90.5%	88.9%	90.5%	90.5%	90.5%	90.5%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	1.10	22.3%	24.6%	25.4%	24.6%	25.4%	26.2%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	1.28	22.3%	30.6%	28.1%	29.2%	37.2%	34.7%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	1.94	94.6%	94.6%	94.6%	94.6%	94.9%	97.3%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	1.86	92.1%	88.4%	90.2%	90.2%	89.0%	89.6%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	1.39	49.1%	49.1%	36.8%	38.6%	45.6%	52.6%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	1.35	56.0%	49.0%	34.0%	36.0%	48.0%	44.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	1.40	61.3%	48.4%	38.7%	45.2%	54.8%	54.8%

Table 30 cont. Average Work Improvement Score and Improvement in Work Performance Areas Among Veterans with a Problem in That Area by Site for FY01.†, ††

| | | | | WORK PERFORMANCE AREAS | | | | | |
VISN	SITE	N	Average Work Improvement	Personal Appearance/ Hygiene	Attendance/ Punctuality	Acceptance of Supervision	Ability to Get Along with Co-workers	Productivity	Quality of Production
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	1.95	97.6%	94.6%	97.6%	97.6%	96.1%	97.1%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	1.40	52.2%	51.1%	45.6%	50.0%	49.2%	49.4%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	1.89	97.4%	84.4%	92.2%	92.2%	94.8%	94.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	1.56	55.6%	63.6%	70.8%	77.0%	69.8%	68.3%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	1.59	93.3%	26.7%	40.0%	46.7%	80.0%	86.7%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	1.97	98.0%	96.1%	98.0%	98.0%	96.1%	96.1%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	1.93	97.6%	95.2%	94.0%	94.0%	95.2%	96.4%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	1.31	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	25.0%	33.3%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	1.46	34.0%	34.3%	39.0%	42.0%	73.0%	76.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	1.96	94.4%	94.4%	100.0%	94.4%	100.0%	100.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	1.44	47.8%	43.5%	52.2%	47.8%	43.5%	47.8%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	1.91	96.8%	90.3%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	1.52	48.8%	55.0%	61.2%	55.8%	59.7%	59.7%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	1.81	95.6%	68.9%	87.4%	88.1%	80.7%	88.9%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	1.68	92.0%	72.0%	86.0%	86.0%	76.0%	78.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	1.50	57.3%	50.8%	51.9%	52.3%	61.2%	61.5%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	1.39	32.6%	47.8%	65.2%	63.0%	47.8%	45.7%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	1.51	64.7%	52.3%	58.4%	60.4%	60.1%	61.0%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	1.82	84.6%	81.5%	83.1%	81.5%	81.5%	83.1%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	1.46	51.4%	45.7%	75.0%	45.7%	45.7%	44.3%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	1.43	47.8%	39.1%	56.5%	65.2%	65.2%	65.2%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	1.91	82.6%	95.7%	100.0%	91.3%	91.3%	91.3%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	1.92	95.5%	91.3%	91.3%	95.7%	95.7%	91.3%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	1.27	33.3%	43.8%	41.2%	58.8%	50.0%	46.7%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	1.59	64.0%	65.4%	63.5%	63.5%	63.5%	67.3%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	1.74	74.6%	74.6%	74.6%	74.6%	74.6%	74.6%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	1.47	46.2%	48.1%	53.8%	53.8%	48.1%	50.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	1.37	35.7%	50.0%	42.9%	39.3%	48.3%	50.0%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	1.64	85.3%	64.7%	73.5%	73.5%	70.6%	67.6%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	1.93	97.8%	87.5%	95.3%	97.7%	93.2%	95.5%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	1.34	51.4%	57.5%	56.4%	60.0%	52.5%	57.5%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	1.47	51.4%	48.6%	51.4%	48.6%	65.7%	65.7%
20	692	White City, OR	84	1.78	70.2%	86.9%	79.8%	81.0%	86.9%	88.1%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	1.33	50.0%	50.0%	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	50.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	1.61	56.7%	60.5%	56.5%	53.3%	71.7%	73.9%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	0.99	25.0%	41.7%	25.0%	33.3%	25.0%	16.7%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	1.08	42.1%	28.7%	29.5%	34.4%	37.9%	37.9%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	1.88	84.2%	86.4%	91.3%	87.0%	87.0%	91.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	1.86	79.8%	85.4%	86.5%	86.5%	88.8%	87.6%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	1.60	73.7%	58.3%	62.5%	73.9%	87.5%	83.3%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)			**1.60**	**67.6%**	**64.1%**	**66.8%**	**66.9%**	**67.5%**	**68.2%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)			**1.61**	**67.1%**	**64.7%**	**66.8%**	**67.1%**	**68.2%**	**69.1%**
SITE S.D.			**0.26**	**25.1%**	**22.0%**	**23.9%**	**22.8%**	**21.9%**	**22.1%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

††Average Work Improvement score is the mean of five work performance areas where the range is 0-2 (0=deteriorated, 1=unchanged and 2=improved).

Table 31. Clinical Improvement Noted Among Veterans with Problems by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Problems Improved %	Drug Problems Improved %	Non-Substance Abuse Mental Health Problems Improved %	Medical Problems Improved %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	28.7%	29.0%	18.4%	11.9%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	45.7%	52.9%	30.6%	26.0%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	68.4%	58.3%	50.0%	33.9%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	69.1%	84.5%	58.5%	39.3%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	84.4%	88.9%	82.9%	80.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	68.9%	75.8%	60.9%	53.6%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	57.4%	60.5%	18.2%	14.6%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	66.7%	64.3%	80.0%	83.3%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	85.3%	86.2%	84.4%	86.2%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	38.5%	34.1%	19.5%	6.5%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	47.3%	46.7%	25.5%	14.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	70.1%	65.2%	72.0%	20.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	85.0%	76.2%	70.0%	30.0%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	68.5%	67.2%	61.7%	85.8%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	30.9%	28.1%	10.9%	9.3%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	46.4%	42.6%	41.7%	18.2%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	38.1%	34.1%	23.4%	26.0%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	95.2%	82.8%	91.2%	34.6%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	88.9%	88.7%	64.0%	52.0%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	89.4%	87.5%	60.0%	38.9%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	85.7%	70.0%	85.0%	100.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	79.9%	82.8%	81.2%	59.1%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	50.0%	54.5%	71.4%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	93.1%	90.0%	58.3%	14.3%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	76.9%	74.6%	62.4%	52.1%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	59.5%	54.0%	50.0%	46.7%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	83.3%	83.3%	100.0%	87.5%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	84.4%	85.3%	55.3%	14.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	41.7%	41.7%	10.0%	9.1%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	86.7%	83.3%	89.5%	90.9%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	61.4%	62.5%	39.8%	25.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	35.0%	32.4%	41.5%	17.1%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	91.3%	81.8%	92.9%	91.7%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	61.1%	39.6%	40.4%	31.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	5.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	82.7%	47.5%	75.0%	45.5%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	50.9%	60.8%	39.5%	48.5%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	76.9%	67.9%	43.3%	7.1%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	59.3%	55.6%	44.0%	0.0%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	66.7%	63.2%	51.7%	40.7%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	61.2%	53.1%	41.0%	35.7%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	55.9%	46.2%	39.1%	38.1%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	85.4%	94.4%	81.6%	71.8%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	38.0%	35.5%	13.7%	2.7%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	54.6%	55.2%	30.7%	23.2%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	95.2%	95.9%	94.0%	94.6%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	79.6%	78.7%	81.2%	53.5%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	54.5%	43.4%	24.1%	22.6%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	35.0%	22.7%	38.5%	0.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	35.0%	6.3%	42.3%	8.7%

Table 31 cont. Clinical Improvement Noted Among Veterans with Problems by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Alcohol Problems Improved %	Drug Problems Improved %	Non-Substance Abuse Mental Health Problems Improved %	Medical Problems Improved %
12	556	**North Chicago, IL**	205	88.3%	86.2%	62.9%	34.7%
12	578	**Hines, IL**	180	45.7%	43.3%	36.5%	18.8%
12	676	**Tomah, WI**	77	83.9%	79.3%	70.6%	71.7%
12	695	**Milwaukee, WI**	66	75.5%	68.4%	67.3%	53.1%
13	438	**Sioux Falls, SD**	15	71.4%	38.5%	20.0%	0.0%
13	568	**Ft. Meade, SD**	51	95.6%	75.0%	97.7%	97.4%
13	568A4	**Hot Springs, SD**	83	80.5%	93.3%	76.6%	66.7%
13	618	**Minneapolis, MN**	12	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%
13	656	**St. Cloud, MN**	100	46.2%	38.5%	32.1%	20.3%
14	636A7	**Knoxville, IA**	18	77.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
15	677	**Topeka, KS**	23	13.6%	13.3%	0.0%	25.0%
15	677A4	**Leavenworth, KS**	62	59.3%	58.2%	49.1%	49.1%
16	520	**Biloxi, MS**	129	76.6%	81.4%	53.8%	51.0%
16	580	**Houston, TX**	135	80.6%	85.0%	74.6%	72.4%
16	586	**Jackson, MS**	50	35.9%	28.6%	5.3%	14.3%
16	598	**Little Rock, AR**	260	73.2%	74.4%	25.2%	15.3%
16	635	**Oklahoma City, OK**	46	60.0%	55.6%	13.0%	6.1%
17	549	**Dallas, TX**	346	51.4%	48.7%	43.8%	36.0%
17	549A4	**Bonham, TX**	65	85.7%	82.1%	75.0%	68.8%
17	549BY	**Fort Worth, TX**	70	44.6%	46.9%	46.3%	42.4%
17	671	**San Antonio, TX**	23	42.9%	37.5%	16.7%	0.0%
17	674	**Temple, TX**	23	73.3%	62.5%	50.0%	22.2%
17	674A4	**Waco, TX**	23	60.0%	55.6%	77.8%	66.7%
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	17	33.3%	36.4%	27.3%	25.0%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	52	40.6%	37.5%	42.5%	28.6%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	122	75.3%	95.7%	68.0%	73.3%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	39.6%	31.3%	26.3%	31.0%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	29	31.6%	53.8%	47.8%	28.6%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	34	65.6%	68.8%	66.7%	61.8%
20	648	**Portland, OR**	88	86.7%	92.1%	91.5%	92.5%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	41	27.3%	35.0%	35.3%	5.3%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	35	36.4%	30.0%	44.8%	37.9%
20	692	**White City, OR**	84	72.9%	74.1%	67.9%	59.7%
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	10	25.0%	66.7%	42.9%	0.0%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	47	64.1%	66.7%	53.8%	38.9%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	44.4%	28.6%	30.0%	36.4%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	96	36.4%	34.9%	21.6%	14.5%
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	23	81.3%	82.4%	76.9%	75.0%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	89	78.5%	76.3%	57.5%	54.9%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	24	90.9%	100.0%	61.1%	47.4%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**64.1%**	**62.7%**	**49.2%**	**40.0%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**62.8%**	**60.9%**	**51.8%**	**39.3%**
SITE S.D.				**21.6%**	**23.3%**	**24.8%**	**28.6%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 32. Veterans' Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY01.

VISN		SITE	N	Ready for Competitive Employment %	Competitively Employed at Discharge %	Employed in VA's IT %	Student, Trainee or Unpaid Volunteer %	Unemployed %	Retired/ Disabled %	Unknown %	Other %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	46.9%	24.7%	0.0%	1.7%	34.6%	7.3%	29.9%	1.7%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	64.7%	58.8%	0.0%	2.0%	19.6%	13.7%	2.0%	3.9%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	40.0%	15.1%	0.0%	0.0%	29.1%	12.8%	22.1%	20.9%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	61.7%	52.6%	1.7%	0.6%	20.6%	7.4%	14.3%	2.9%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	25.7%	8.6%	0.0%	2.9%	25.7%	54.3%	8.6%	0.0%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	61.6%	42.5%	4.1%	4.1%	13.7%	16.4%	12.3%	6.8%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	46.3%	38.9%	1.9%	0.0%	37.0%	7.4%	14.8%	0.0%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	66.7%	54.2%	4.2%	8.3%	8.3%	4.2%	12.5%	8.3%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	82.6%	65.1%	9.2%	3.7%	9.2%	0.9%	8.3%	3.7%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	46.9%	35.9%	0.0%	4.7%	42.2%	12.5%	3.1%	1.6%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	54.0%	50.4%	0.0%	1.8%	8.8%	28.3%	10.6%	0.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	59.1%	42.6%	0.9%	5.2%	36.5%	9.6%	0.9%	4.3%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	71.4%	61.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	9.5%	23.8%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	77.5%	56.5%	2.3%	2.3%	9.9%	0.8%	14.5%	13.7%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	63.4%	31.0%	0.0%	3.5%	23.9%	4.2%	25.4%	12.0%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	34.8%	31.8%	0.0%	4.5%	36.4%	4.5%	16.7%	6.1%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	22.0%	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	31.7%	9.8%	37.8%	3.7%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	80.0%	35.6%	0.0%	4.4%	40.0%	2.2%	0.0%	17.8%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	83.9%	53.6%	0.0%	1.5%	7.3%	3.8%	32.2%	1.5%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	73.4%	53.2%	0.0%	1.1%	41.5%	2.1%	2.1%	0.0%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	65.2%	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	60.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	44.7%	36.5%	4.7%	4.7%	15.9%	17.6%	14.1%	6.5%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	58.3%	8.3%	0.0%	25.0%	41.7%	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	68.3%	24.4%	4.9%	9.8%	34.1%	17.1%	4.9%	4.9%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	63.5%	36.0%	0.0%	0.9%	14.0%	28.4%	12.2%	8.6%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	48.8%	48.8%	0.0%	2.4%	43.9%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	80.0%	40.0%	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	83.7%	58.1%	2.3%	1.2%	19.8%	9.3%	8.1%	1.2%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	65.2%	54.2%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	20.8%	0.0%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	50.0%	28.9%	5.3%	2.6%	42.1%	18.4%	2.6%	0.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	50.8%	44.1%	0.0%	1.5%	16.9%	5.1%	30.3%	2.1%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	38.0%	22.0%	4.0%	8.0%	22.0%	36.0%	6.0%	2.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	68.5%	64.8%	0.0%	3.7%	1.9%	7.4%	20.4%	1.9%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	48.8%	51.3%	1.3%	3.8%	7.5%	16.3%	16.3%	3.8%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	47.6%	9.5%	0.0%	4.8%	52.4%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	76.4%	41.7%	1.4%	1.4%	30.6%	12.5%	8.3%	4.2%
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	49.6%	35.6%	0.0%	0.7%	16.3%	11.1%	28.9%	7.4%
8	546	Miami, FL	39	61.5%	59.0%	0.0%	12.8%	12.8%	2.6%	12.8%	0.0%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	60.0%	57.1%	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	25.7%	11.4%	2.9%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	72.6%	50.0%	0.0%	11.3%	1.6%	17.7%	19.4%	0.0%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	73.1%	73.1%	0.0%	1.3%	6.4%	1.3%	16.7%	1.3%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	51.4%	40.5%	0.0%	5.4%	21.6%	13.5%	18.9%	0.0%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	88.1%	37.3%	1.6%	1.6%	30.2%	6.3%	22.2%	0.8%
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	59.2%	27.7%	0.8%	0.8%	38.5%	30.8%	1.5%	0.0%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	72.5%	47.9%	5.0%	0.0%	32.2%	6.6%	8.3%	0.0%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	91.3%	83.8%	0.0%	0.7%	4.7%	8.8%	1.4%	0.7%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	51.8%	37.8%	0.0%	6.7%	43.3%	8.5%	3.0%	0.6%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	49.1%	38.6%	3.5%	10.5%	38.6%	3.5%	1.8%	3.5%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	36.0%	30.0%	2.0%	6.0%	22.0%	22.0%	14.0%	4.0%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	48.4%	35.5%	3.2%	0.0%	32.3%	22.6%	3.2%	3.2%

Table 32 cont. Veterans' Employment Status at Discharge by Site for FY01. [†]

VISN	SITE		N	Ready for Competitive Employment %	Competitively Employed at Discharge %	Employed in VA's IT %	Student, Trainee or Unpaid Volunteer %	Unemployed %	Retired/ Disabled %	Unknown %	Other %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	76.6%	59.0%	0.5%	1.5%	31.7%	3.4%	1.5%	2.4%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	38.3%	37.2%	0.0%	3.3%	20.0%	12.8%	23.9%	2.8%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	37.7%	30.3%	1.3%	2.6%	38.2%	27.6%	0.0%	0.0%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	34.8%	30.3%	6.1%	3.0%	31.8%	15.2%	12.1%	1.5%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	53.3%	20.0%	0.0%	13.3%	46.7%	6.7%	13.3%	0.0%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	62.7%	45.1%	2.0%	5.9%	11.8%	19.6%	9.8%	5.9%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	91.6%	41.0%	0.0%	3.6%	34.9%	14.5%	4.8%	1.2%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	91.7%	66.7%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	59.0%	27.0%	2.0%	1.0%	40.0%	14.0%	13.0%	3.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	66.7%	55.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	11.1%	27.8%	0.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	82.6%	26.1%	4.3%	0.0%	43.5%	8.7%	17.4%	0.0%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	53.2%	41.9%	0.0%	3.2%	22.6%	11.3%	21.0%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	59.7%	48.1%	0.0%	0.8%	41.1%	5.4%	4.7%	0.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	80.7%	48.1%	0.0%	8.9%	8.9%	14.8%	15.6%	3.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	60.0%	38.0%	0.0%	4.0%	44.0%	6.0%	8.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	87.3%	48.8%	1.5%	1.2%	36.5%	10.0%	1.5%	0.4%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	32.6%	26.1%	0.0%	0.0%	23.9%	13.0%	34.8%	2.2%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	24.6%	21.4%	0.3%	2.9%	39.9%	7.5%	23.7%	4.3%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	69.2%	49.2%	0.0%	3.1%	26.2%	4.6%	4.6%	12.3%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	51.4%	30.0%	5.7%	2.9%	42.9%	7.1%	10.0%	1.4%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	43.5%	30.4%	0.0%	8.7%	4.3%	21.7%	26.1%	8.7%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	73.9%	69.6%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	21.7%	0.0%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	87.0%	39.1%	0.0%	4.3%	30.4%	8.7%	17.4%	0.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	41.2%	35.3%	5.9%	0.0%	47.1%	5.9%	0.0%	5.9%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	69.2%	53.8%	0.0%	5.8%	17.3%	7.7%	9.6%	5.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	89.3%	40.2%	0.0%	0.8%	54.1%	2.5%	2.5%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	40.4%	34.6%	0.0%	1.9%	26.9%	19.2%	17.3%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	55.2%	44.8%	6.9%	10.3%	10.3%	6.9%	6.9%	13.8%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	50.0%	35.3%	0.0%	8.8%	17.6%	8.8%	29.4%	0.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	68.2%	34.1%	6.8%	5.7%	34.1%	12.5%	6.8%	0.0%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	56.1%	9.8%	0.0%	2.4%	80.5%	2.4%	2.4%	2.4%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	60.0%	34.3%	17.1%	14.3%	22.9%	2.9%	5.7%	2.9%
20	692	White City, OR	84	83.3%	47.6%	0.0%	2.4%	11.9%	9.5%	28.6%	0.0%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	40.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	20.0%	0.0%	10.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	57.4%	55.3%	0.0%	2.1%	27.7%	0.0%	10.6%	4.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	50.0%	8.3%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	22.9%	16.7%	0.0%	3.1%	28.1%	10.4%	39.6%	2.1%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	82.6%	69.6%	0.0%	0.0%	17.4%	4.3%	4.3%	4.3%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	48.3%	46.1%	0.0%	7.9%	5.6%	23.6%	16.9%	0.0%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	45.8%	41.7%	8.3%	12.5%	0.0%	29.2%	4.2%	4.2%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**59.9%**	**41.1%**	**1.2%**	**3.1%**	**25.9%**	**10.9%**	**14.4%**	**3.3%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**59.3%**	**40.9%**	**1.5%**	**3.9%**	**25.3%**	**11.6%**	**13.2%**	**3.5%**
SITE S.D.				**17.6%**	**15.2%**	**2.8%**	**4.2%**	**15.8%**	**10.0%**	**10.0%**	**5.0%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

Table 33. Veterans' Arrangements for Housing After Discharge by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Homeless / Unknown %	Other %
1	518	**Bedford, MA**	344	35.2%	14.0%	6.1%	42.7%	2.0%
1	523	**Boston, MA**	51	78.4%	2.0%	7.8%	9.8%	2.0%
1	523A5	**Brockton, MA**	86	26.7%	40.7%	7.0%	25.6%	0.0%
1	631	**Northampton, MA**	175	38.3%	12.6%	6.3%	41.7%	1.1%
1	650	**Providence, RI**	35	77.1%	0.0%	2.9%	20.0%	0.0%
1	689	**West Haven, CT**	73	69.9%	4.1%	2.7%	20.5%	2.7%
2	528	**Buffalo, NY**	54	87.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	0.0%
2	528A5	**Canandaigua, NY**	24	62.5%	0.0%	25.0%	8.3%	4.2%
2	528A6	**Bath, NY**	109	65.1%	14.7%	8.3%	11.0%	0.9%
2	528A7	**Syracuse, NY**	64	67.2%	18.8%	4.7%	9.4%	0.0%
2	528A8	**Albany, NY**	113	63.7%	12.4%	3.5%	19.5%	0.9%
3	526	**Bronx, NY**	115	60.5%	6.1%	0.9%	25.4%	7.0%
3	561	**E. Orange, NJ**	21	66.7%	0.0%	23.8%	9.5%	0.0%
3	561A4	**Lyons, NJ**	131	48.9%	16.0%	13.0%	22.1%	0.0%
3	620	**Montrose, NY**	142	64.8%	0.0%	9.9%	24.6%	0.7%
3	630A4	**Brooklyn, NY**	66	45.5%	34.8%	3.0%	15.2%	1.5%
3	632	**Northport, NY**	82	35.4%	3.7%	20.7%	35.4%	4.9%
4	529	**Butler, PA**	45	35.6%	15.6%	48.9%	0.0%	0.0%
4	542	**Coatesville, PA**	261	21.5%	12.3%	37.2%	29.1%	0.0%
4	595	**Lebanon, PA**	94	51.1%	28.7%	5.3%	12.8%	2.1%
4	642	**Philadelphia, PA**	23	73.9%	26.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	646A5	**Pittsburgh (HD),PA**	170	62.4%	7.1%	14.7%	14.7%	1.2%
5	512	**Baltimore, MD**	12	41.7%	25.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
5	512A5	**Perry Point, MD**	41	39.0%	29.3%	19.5%	9.8%	2.4%
5	613	**Martinsburg, WV**	222	32.9%	9.5%	42.8%	13.1%	1.8%
5	688	**Washington, DC**	82	62.2%	26.8%	0.0%	9.8%	1.2%
6	558	**Durham, NC**	10	60.0%	10.0%	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%
6	590	**Hampton, VA**	86	62.8%	12.8%	9.3%	12.8%	2.3%
6	637	**Asheville, NC**	24	58.3%	29.2%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%
6	658	**Salem, VA**	38	63.2%	18.4%	2.6%	13.2%	2.6%
7	508	**Atlanta, GA**	195	35.4%	22.6%	3.1%	37.4%	1.5%
7	509	**Augusta, GA**	50	52.0%	14.0%	14.0%	20.0%	0.0%
7	521	**Birmingham, AL**	54	75.9%	1.9%	0.0%	20.4%	1.9%
7	534	**Charleston, SC**	80	63.8%	7.5%	2.5%	23.8%	2.5%
7	619A4	**Tuskegee, AL**	21	42.9%	4.8%	0.0%	42.9%	9.5%
7	679	**Tuscaloosa, AL**	72	69.4%	5.6%	6.9%	13.9%	4.2%
8	516	**Bay Pines, FL**	135	45.2%	3.7%	14.8%	31.1%	5.2%
8	546	**Miami, FL**	39	71.8%	7.7%	2.6%	17.9%	0.0%
8	548	**West Palm Beach, FL**	35	40.0%	42.9%	2.9%	11.4%	2.9%
8	573	**Gainesville/Lake City, FL**	62	77.4%	1.6%	0.0%	21.0%	0.0%
8	673	**Tampa, FL**	78	74.4%	6.4%	1.3%	17.9%	0.0%
9	614	**Memphis, TN**	37	64.9%	24.3%	0.0%	10.8%	0.0%
9	621	**Mountain Home, TN**	126	49.2%	4.0%	15.1%	30.2%	1.6%
9	626A4	**Murfreesboro, TN**	130	48.5%	20.0%	5.4%	26.2%	0.0%
10	538	**Chillicothe, OH**	121	37.2%	14.0%	29.8%	17.4%	1.7%
10	539	**Cincinnati, OH**	149	89.3%	0.7%	2.7%	6.7%	0.7%
10	541	**Cleveland, OH**	164	63.4%	4.9%	6.7%	24.4%	0.6%
11	515	**Battle Creek, MI**	57	64.9%	12.3%	1.8%	17.5%	3.5%
11	550	**Danville, IL**	50	62.0%	4.0%	6.0%	28.0%	0.0%
11	583	**Indianapolis, IN**	31	67.7%	16.1%	0.0%	12.9%	3.2%

Table 33 cont. Veterans' Arrangements for Housing After Discharge by Site for FY01.†

VISN		SITE	N	Housed†† %	Transitional Housing or Halfway House %	Hospital, Nursing Home or Domiciliary %	Homeless / Unknown %	Other %
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	33.7%	15.1%	42.0%	8.8%	0.5%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	51.4%	15.6%	7.8%	24.0%	1.1%
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	37.7%	16.9%	9.1%	35.1%	1.3%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	71.2%	1.5%	13.6%	13.6%	0.0%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	46.7%	0.0%	6.7%	40.0%	6.7%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	86.3%	3.9%	3.9%	2.0%	3.9%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	63.9%	6.0%	9.6%	18.1%	2.4%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	66.7%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	51.0%	3.0%	26.0%	18.0%	2.0%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	72.2%	0.0%	5.6%	22.2%	0.0%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	60.9%	0.0%	8.7%	30.4%	0.0%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	48.4%	4.8%	16.1%	30.6%	0.0%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	41.9%	0.0%	44.2%	13.2%	0.8%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	30.6%	47.0%	1.5%	14.2%	6.7%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	62.0%	6.0%	12.0%	20.0%	0.0%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	43.8%	8.5%	33.8%	13.1%	0.8%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	52.2%	2.2%	8.7%	34.8%	2.2%
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	34.7%	8.1%	15.9%	37.9%	3.5%
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	52.3%	7.7%	26.2%	9.2%	4.6%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	41.4%	7.1%	4.3%	44.3%	2.9%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	73.9%	8.7%	0.0%	8.7%	8.7%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	34.8%	0.0%	8.7%	56.5%	0.0%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	39.1%	8.7%	8.7%	43.5%	0.0%
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	76.5%	0.0%	5.9%	11.8%	5.9%
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	51.9%	23.1%	3.8%	17.3%	3.8%
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	59.0%	0.0%	18.9%	22.1%	0.0%
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	40.4%	32.7%	1.9%	25.0%	0.0%
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	69.0%	6.9%	0.0%	17.2%	6.9%
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	52.9%	0.0%	2.9%	44.1%	0.0%
20	648	Portland, OR	88	42.0%	30.7%	15.9%	10.2%	1.1%
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	61.0%	0.0%	2.4%	34.1%	2.4%
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	82.9%	2.9%	5.7%	8.6%	0.0%
20	692	White City, OR	84	42.9%	2.4%	22.6%	31.0%	1.2%
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	0.0%
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	57.4%	10.6%	6.4%	21.3%	4.3%
21	654	Reno, NV	12	58.3%	0.0%	0.0%	41.7%	0.0%
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	36.5%	19.8%	0.0%	42.7%	1.0%
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	73.9%	8.7%	4.3%	13.0%	0.0%
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	82.0%	1.1%	0.0%	15.7%	1.1%
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	79.2%	16.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%
VETERAN AVERAGE (N=7,443)				**50.9%**	**11.6%**	**13.2%**	**22.6%**	**1.7%**
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				**56.5%**	**11.0%**	**9.4%**	**21.3%**	**1.7%**
SITE S.D.				**15.7%**	**10.9%**	**11.2%**	**11.8%**	**2.2%**

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

†† Includes own apartment, room or house; apartment, room or house of friend or family member.

Table 34. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY01.†, ††, †††, ††††

| | | Site Median Value | | 1.59 | 54.6% | 46.7% | 55.3% | 39.3% | 44.1% | 26.9% | 12.3% |
| | | Veteran Average | | 1.60 | 64.1% | 62.7% | 49.2% | 40.0% | 41.4% | 25.9% | 14.4% |

VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	-0.43	-34.2%	-26.0%	-41.4%	-17.6%	-12.5%	9.3%	17.6%
1	523	Boston, MA	51	-0.16	-27.4%	-3.9%	-42.4%	-0.8%	22.2%	-5.3%	-9.7%
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	-0.43	1.2%	-9.8%	-15.4%	3.8%	-24.5%	4.5%	10.0%
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	0.22	14.0%	38.3%	2.0%	0.0%	15.1%	-5.7%	1.7%
1	650	Providence, RI	35	0.24	24.3%	34.9%	21.3%	50.1%	-24.0%	1.1%	-3.7%
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	0.06	8.8%	23.5%	-0.5%	14.9%	6.7%	-9.7%	0.0%
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	-0.41	-13.7%	-7.9%	-41.7%	-16.2%	-2.1%	8.5%	2.8%
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	-0.02	-16.5%	-21.0%	13.4%	40.1%	9.0%	-17.4%	0.9%
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	0.22	33.7%	36.5%	34.6%	58.0%	20.2%	-17.6%	-3.4%
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	-0.44	-41.0%	-43.4%	-61.4%	-53.2%	-4.4%	16.7%	-8.8%
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	-0.11	-11.4%	0.0%	-33.3%	-14.3%	13.4%	-15.6%	-2.0%
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	0.08	16.1%	5.4%	22.1%	-40.1%	0.6%	9.8%	-12.0%
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	0.30	24.7%	11.4%	4.7%	-10.0%	15.2%	-25.5%	-2.3%
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	0.32	13.6%	10.2%	12.4%	59.3%	12.6%	-17.0%	2.0%
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	-0.39	-29.5%	-30.2%	-52.8%	-16.6%	-10.9%	-2.2%	12.4%
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	-0.38	-26.1%	-27.0%	-32.8%	-18.2%	-5.6%	9.2%	4.3%
3	632	Northport, NY	82	-0.22	-11.3%	-10.1%	-19.4%	5.2%	-17.1%	7.8%	25.5%
4	529	Butler, PA	45	0.29	47.1%	17.9%	37.9%	-1.5%	-4.7%	13.4%	-11.6%
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	0.26	35.6%	39.6%	19.2%	26.8%	10.4%	-20.0%	18.8%
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	0.25	30.4%	31.5%	8.8%	-18.6%	9.3%	14.0%	-9.6%
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	0.39	22.3%	-0.2%	26.5%	80.0%	-1.6%	34.0%	-12.5%
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	0.19	13.6%	22.6%	26.6%	31.7%	-4.7%	-10.6%	2.2%
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	0.29	-24.5%	-16.5%	26.9%	-46.7%	-34.9%	14.4%	4.2%
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	-0.07	40.3%	43.0%	0.8%	-18.5%	-16.9%	8.5%	-7.0%
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	0.20	18.3%	19.1%	6.0%	17.1%	-6.0%	-12.4%	0.5%
5	688	Washington, DC	82	-0.16	-5.8%	-20.6%	-16.0%	17.8%	7.4%	16.1%	-12.2%
6	558	Durham, NC	10	0.25	16.2%	19.8%	49.1%	65.2%	-7.7%	-15.9%	7.4%
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	0.24	27.1%	33.2%	0.0%	-21.7%	15.0%	-6.7%	-3.5%
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	-0.05	-15.2%	-12.5%	-48.1%	-33.2%	11.6%	-13.2%	9.2%
6	658	Salem, VA	38	0.33	29.6%	26.1%	42.6%	75.3%	-11.2%	17.7%	-10.0%
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	-0.32	-15.6%	-7.9%	-11.4%	-7.3%	0.0%	-10.0%	18.0%
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	0.09	-23.0%	-13.4%	-5.4%	9.9%	-11.5%	-1.5%	-6.0%
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	0.24	39.3%	33.6%	50.5%	72.6%	21.1%	-22.9%	8.7%
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	0.05	-8.1%	-37.6%	-14.8%	-1.3%	-11.3%	-18.1%	4.3%
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	-0.24	-74.0%	-90.4%	-56.6%	-46.4%	-35.3%	26.6%	21.7%
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	0.11	28.7%	-33.5%	18.8%	0.2%	-1.9%	4.6%	-3.6%

87

Table 34. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY01.†, ††, †††, ††††

| | | Site Median Value | | 1.59 | 54.6% | 46.7% | 55.3% | 39.3% | 44.1% | 26.9% | 12.3% |
| | | Veteran Average | | 1.60 | 64.1% | 62.7% | 49.2% | 40.0% | 41.4% | 25.9% | 14.4% |

VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	-0.06	**-35.4%**	-12.8%	**-41.2%**	0.7%	-7.6%	-9.1%	**16.9%**
8	546	Miami, FL	39	0.00	16.2%	3.5%	-7.5%	**-28.7%**	17.9%	-12.8%	1.1%
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	-0.09	-3.2%	3.6%	-21.0%	**-47.6%**	17.9%	-26.4%	-0.7%
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	0.14	3.8%	5.8%	-3.7%	9.2%	10.7%	-23.8%	7.4%
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	**-0.46**	0.4%	-7.6%	-22.2%	6.7%	28.4%	-20.0%	3.8%
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	0.06	5.3%	2.9%	-9.7%	-2.3%	2.4%	-7.7%	6.8%
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	0.24	35.6%	39.7%	26.0%	32.2%	-8.0%	4.2%	**10.5%**
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	**-0.49**	**-39.5%**	**-37.8%**	**-52.4%**	**-31.1%**	-9.3%	13.4%	-10.6%
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	**-0.31**	0.0%	7.3%	-22.6%	-7.9%	7.9%	6.6%	-3.7%
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	0.31	45.3%	48.5%	45.2%	70.3%	40.8%	-21.4%	-10.5%
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	0.25	12.4%	15.3%	31.1%	21.3%	-3.4%	**17.4%**	-9.4%
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	**-0.22**	-1.2%	-14.3%	-24.5%	-3.7%	-4.9%	11.9%	-10.6%
11	550	Danville, IL	50	**-0.24**	**-41.3%**	**-31.9%**	-19.6%	**-29.5%**	-9.0%	-5.6%	1.5%
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	-0.19	**-33.6%**	**-69.6%**	-21.4%	**-50.5%**	-3.6%	7.6%	-9.0%
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	0.32	27.8%	28.7%	7.1%	7.0%	14.6%	5.3%	-10.9%
12	578	Hines, IL	180	-0.19	**-21.2%**	**-19.8%**	**-28.7%**	-15.3%	0.2%	-4.3%	**12.2%**
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	0.28	22.2%	18.1%	12.5%	46.8%	-7.6%	12.3%	-11.8%
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	-0.03	19.3%	6.0%	9.7%	23.2%	-5.0%	8.3%	0.5%
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	-0.05	-4.2%	-39.9%	**-59.8%**	-21.0%	-9.4%	19.5%	-0.4%
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	0.37	48.3%	29.3%	54.0%	81.2%	6.9%	-12.9%	-2.0%
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	0.29	12.8%	39.0%	20.7%	32.4%	1.7%	9.4%	-7.0%
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	**-0.34**	48.0%	51.8%	14.1%	-20.0%	20.2%	-26.0%	13.4%
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	-0.13	-18.2%	-12.0%	-20.5%	-4.9%	-9.4%	**15.4%**	1.2%
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	0.39	32.9%	55.5%	55.9%	77.0%	21.5%	-20.8%	16.2%
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	-0.19	**-56.4%**	**-37.2%**	**-45.7%**	3.1%	-16.9%	19.0%	5.5%
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	0.28	-17.6%	-21.5%	-18.0%	12.9%	5.0%	-2.6%	9.3%
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	-0.11	17.1%	29.4%	8.7%	20.8%	4.5%	**15.3%**	-8.0%
16	580	Houston, TX	135	0.21	23.1%	33.8%	22.9%	46.5%	8.0%	-15.4%	3.2%
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	0.05	**-56.8%**	**-73.5%**	**-113.5%**	**-31.8%**	-4.8%	**18.3%**	-4.8%
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	**-0.14**	1.5%	8.1%	**-25.6%**	-12.1%	6.0%	10.7%	-10.2%
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	**-0.23**	-4.5%	-7.9%	**-60.5%**	**-39.0%**	-13.3%	-1.3%	**23.0%**
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	-0.10	-3.5%	-13.4%	-14.3%	4.3%	**-19.4%**	**12.5%**	**10.7%**
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	0.19	27.9%	25.5%	27.9%	46.4%	7.1%	0.5%	-7.0%
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	-0.16	-6.0%	2.4%	-0.5%	21.9%	-10.7%	**17.8%**	-3.6%
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	-0.18	-19.6%	-8.4%	-39.3%	**-91.5%**	-14.7%	-19.3%	14.5%
17	674	Temple, TX	23	0.30	11.5%	-9.8%	-2.4%	-2.8%	27.4%	-24.8%	9.4%
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	0.27	-27.8%	-10.3%	26.3%	7.6%	-13.7%	10.6%	5.7%

Table 34. Percent and Direction From Median Performance of CWT/VI Sites: Critical Outcome Monitor Measures for FY01.†, ††, †††, ††††

Site Median Value		**1.59**	**54.6%**	**46.7%**	**55.3%**	**39.3%**	**44.1%**	**26.9%**	**12.3%**
Veteran Average		**1.60**	**64.1%**	**62.7%**	**49.2%**	**40.0%**	**41.4%**	**25.9%**	**14.4%**

VISN	SITE	SITE	#VETS	AVERAGE WORK IMPROVEMENT	ALCOHOL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	DRUG PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	MEDICAL PROBLEMS IMPROVED††† %	COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	UNEMPLOYED AT DISCHARGE %	EMPLOYMENT STATUS UNKNOWN AT DISCHARGE %
18	501	**Albuquerque, NM**	17	**-0.33**	-29.6%	-36.9%	**-86.1%**	-22.3%	-4.7%	20.6%	-12.4%
18	644	**Phoenix, AZ**	52	0.00	**-40.7%**	**-33.5%**	-22.3%	-2.9%	14.7%	-7.7%	-2.7%
18	649	**Prescott, AZ**	122	0.11	4.0%	45.6%	16.1%	47.0%	-1.1%	**28.9%**	-9.4%
18	678	**Tucson, AZ**	52	-0.16	**-37.5%**	**-41.2%**	**-64.4%**	-11.6%	-7.5%	0.0%	5.6%
19	660	**Salt Lake City, UT**	29	**-0.21**	**-62.2%**	-28.4%	-19.3%	-13.4%	7.7%	-14.6%	-5.4%
20	463	**Anchorage, AK**	34	0.02	4.9%	16.0%	22.0%	34.5%	-4.3%	-7.8%	**17.2%**
20	648	**Portland, OR**	88	0.31	29.2%	39.3%	38.3%	60.1%	-6.6%	8.3%	-4.9%
20	653	**Roseburg, OR**	41	**-0.27**	**-64.2%**	**-38.9%**	-27.3%	-16.9%	**-29.4%**	**52.9%**	-10.4%
20	663A4	**American Lake, WA**	35	-0.14	-31.2%	**-36.7%**	-14.0%	14.7%	-7.3%	0.5%	-5.9%
20	692	**White City, OR**	84	0.14	18.7%	18.7%	17.8%	29.7%	5.2%	-14.0%	**16.9%**
21	459	**Honolulu, HI**	10	-0.25	-21.9%	22.0%	-26.6%	-32.2%	1.9%	6.4%	-13.3%
21	640	**Palo Alto, CA**	47	-0.01	-2.9%	-1.4%	-1.3%	10.4%	15.0%	1.7%	-1.4%
21	654	**Reno, NV**	12	**-0.55**	-19.5%	-37.3%	**-49.4%**	6.2%	-9.6%	-6.2%	-5.0%
21	662	**San Francisco, CA**	96	**-0.51**	**-35.0%**	**-35.9%**	**-54.8%**	**-42.4%**	**-19.4%**	2.1%	**27.3%**
22	600	**Long Beach, CA**	23	0.25	18.9%	36.0%	31.2%	45.6%	28.8%	-7.9%	-7.4%
22	605	**Loma Linda, CA**	89	0.25	20.5%	18.3%	-1.5%	27.0%	6.9%	-19.9%	5.0%
22	664	**San Diego, CA**	24	0.07	47.5%	61.7%	1.1%	15.6%	16.0%	-20.0%	-7.7%

† Outcomes have been adjusted for the following veteran characteristics: Age, race, marital status, education, previous employment history, receipt of disability benefits, history of psychiatric hospitalizations, and clinical psychiatric diagnoses; including serious psychiatric illness and substance abuse problems.

† The following sites were excluded from this table because they had data on fewer than 10 discharges during FY01: VISN 1, White River Junction; VISN 4, Wilkes Barre; VISN 5, Ft. Howard; VISN 6, Richmond; VISN 7, Columbia, SC and Dublin; VISN 10, Dayton; VISN 11, Ann Arbor; VISN 12, Iron Mountain; VISN 14 Des Moines; VISN 15, Columbia, MO, Poplar Bluff, Kansas City, and St. Louis; VISN 18, El Paso; VISN 19, Sheridan and VISN 22, Sepulveda and West Los Angeles.

††† Only veterans with a problem in the clinical area were included in this analysis.

†††† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans with the clinical problem is fewer than 10.

68

Table 35. Summary of Outliers by Site for FY01.

VISN	SITE		N	VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC CRITICAL MONITOR	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
1	518	Bedford, MA	344	0	1	7	8
1	523	Boston, MA	51	0	0	2	2
1	523A5	Brockton, MA	86	0	1	2	3
1	631	Northampton, MA	175	0	0	0	0
1	650	Providence, RI	35	0	1	1	2
1	689	West Haven, CT	73	0	0	0	0
2	528	Buffalo, NY	54	0	1	2	3
2	528A5	Canandaigua, NY	24	0	0	0	0
2	528A6	Bath, NY	109	0	0	0	0
2	528A7	Syracuse, NY	64	0	0	6	6
2	528A8	Albany, NY	113	0	0	1	1
3	526	Bronx, NY	115	0	0	1	1
3	561	E. Orange, NJ	21	0	0	0	0
3	561A4	Lyons, NJ	131	0	1	0	1
3	620	Montrose, NY	142	0	0	6	6
3	630A4	Brooklyn, NY	66	0	0	4	4
3	632	Northport, NY	82	0	2	3	5
4	529	Butler, PA	45	0	0	0	0
4	542	Coatesville, PA	261	1	0	1	2
4	595	Lebanon, PA	94	1	0	0	1
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	23	0	0	1	1
4	646A5	Pittsburgh (HD),PA	170	0	0	0	0
5	512	Baltimore, MD	12	0	1	2	3
5	512A5	Perry Point, MD	41	0	1	1	2
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	222	0	0	0	0
5	688	Washington, DC	82	0	1	1	2
6	558	Durham, NC	10	1	0	0	1
6	590	Hampton, VA	86	0	1	1	2
6	637	Asheville, NC	24	1	0	1	2
6	658	Salem, VA	38	0	0	1	1
7	508	Atlanta, GA	195	0	0	2	2
7	509	Augusta, GA	50	0	1	0	1
7	521	Birmingham, AL	54	0	0	0	0
7	534	Charleston, SC	80	0	1	1	2
7	619A4	Tuskegee, AL	21	0	1	7	8
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	72	0	1	1	2
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	135	1	0	3	4
8	546	Miami, FL	39	0	0	1	1
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	35	0	0	1	1
8	573	Gainesville/Lake City, FL	62	0	0	0	0
8	673	Tampa, FL	78	0	0	1	1
9	614	Memphis, TN	37	1	0	0	1
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	126	1	1	1	3
9	626A4	Murfreesboro, TN	130	0	1	5	6
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	121	0	1	1	2
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	149	0	1	0	1
10	541	Cleveland, OH	164	0	1	1	2
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	57	0	0	1	1
11	550	Danville, IL	50	0	0	4	4
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	31	0	0	3	3

Table 35 cont. Summary of Outliers by Site for FY01.

VISN		SITE	N	VETERAN CHARACTERISTIC CRITICAL MONITOR	PROGRAM PARTICIPATION CRITICAL MONITORS	ADJUSTED OUTCOME MONITORS	TOTAL NUMBER OF OUTLIERS
12	556	North Chicago, IL	205	0	0	0	0
12	578	Hines, IL	180	0	1	5	6
12	676	Tomah, WI	77	0	1	0	1
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	66	0	0	0	0
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	15	0	1	1	2
13	568	Ft. Meade, SD	51	0	0	0	0
13	568A4	Hot Springs, SD	83	0	1	0	1
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	12	1	0	1	2
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	100	0	2	1	3
14	636A7	Knoxville, IA	18	0	1	0	1
15	677	Topeka, KS	23	0	1	3	4
15	677A4	Leavenworth, KS	62	0	1	0	1
16	520	Biloxi, MS	129	1	0	1	2
16	580	Houston, TX	135	0	0	0	0
16	586	Jackson, MS	50	1	1	5	7
16	598	Little Rock, AR	260	0	0	2	2
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	46	0	2	4	6
17	549	Dallas, TX	346	0	1	3	4
17	549A4	Bonham, TX	65	0	0	0	0
17	549BY	Fort Worth, TX	70	0	1	1	2
17	671	San Antonio, TX	23	0	1	1	2
17	674	Temple, TX	23	0	1	0	1
17	674A4	Waco, TX	23	1	1	0	2
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	17	0	0	2	2
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	52	0	0	2	2
18	649	Prescott, AZ	122	1	0	1	2
18	678	Tucson, AZ	52	0	1	3	4
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	29	0	0	2	2
20	463	Anchorage, AK	34	0	2	1	3
20	648	Portland, OR	88	0	0	0	0
20	653	Roseburg, OR	41	0	2	5	7
20	663A4	American Lake, WA	35	0	1	1	2
20	692	White City, OR	84	0	0	1	1
21	459	Honolulu, HI	10	0	2	0	2
21	640	Palo Alto, CA	47	0	0	0	0
21	654	Reno, NV	12	0	2	2	4
21	662	San Francisco, CA	96	0	2	7	9
22	600	Long Beach, CA	23	0	0	0	0
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	89	1	0	0	1
22	664	San Diego, CA	24	0	0	0	0
SITE AVERAGE (N=90)				0.1	0.5	1.5	2.2
SITE S.D.				0.4	0.7	1.7	2.2

91

Table 36a. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement
1	White River Junction, VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***
1	Bedford, MA	**-0.41**	-0.39	**-0.27**	**-0.34**	**-0.43**
1	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-0.23**	-0.16
1	Brockton, MA	0.18	0.08	-0.05	**-0.21**	**-0.43**
1	Manchester, NH	**-0.43**	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	Northampton, MA	0.03	0.09	0.03	0.07	0.22
1	Providence, RI	-0.12	-0.08	-0.09	0.08	0.24
1	West Haven, CT	-0.01	-0.11	0.21	-0.04	0.06
2	Buffalo, NY	**-0.42**	**-0.50**	**-0.54**	**-0.47**	**-0.41**
2	Canandaigua, NY	0.00	**-0.19**	-0.01	0.08	-0.02
2	Bath, NY	0.48	0.42	0.39	0.19	0.22
2	Syracuse, NY	0.08	0.03	**-0.24**	0.00	**-0.44**
2	Albany, NY	**-0.34**	**-0.22**	-0.09	0.04	-0.11
3	Bronx, NY	0.01	0.42	0.07	0.15	0.08
3	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	-0.01	0.01	*see below*
3	East Orange, NJ	-0.08	0.23	*see above*	*see above*	0.30
3	Lyons, NJ	0.12	0.28	*see above*	*see above*	0.32
3	Montrose, NY	**-0.35**	-0.10	**-0.16**	-0.11	**-0.39**
3	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	-0.08	-0.10	**-0.23**	**-0.38**
3	Northport, NY	0.08	0.23	0.10	***	**-0.22**
4	Butler, PA	***	0.24	0.36	0.37	0.29
4	Coatesville, PA	0.04	0.24	0.31	0.27	0.26
4	Lebanon, PA	0.07	0.00	0.10	0.17	0.25
4	Philadelphia, PA	***	0.46	0.46	0.42	0.39
4	Pittsburgh, PA	**-0.59**	**-0.14**	0.05	0.13	0.19
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
5	Baltimore, MD	***	0.17	0.32	-0.03	0.29
5	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	0.02	0.08	***
5	Perry Point, MD	0.10	-0.12	0.25	***	-0.07
5	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-0.08	0.01	0.20
5	Washington DC	**-0.54**	**-0.31**	-0.13	**-0.28**	-0.16
6	Durham, NC	0.02	0.03	-0.02	0.23	0.25
6	Hampton, VA	0.18	-0.06	0.11	0.11	0.24
6	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	***	-0.05
6	Richmond, VA	**-0.30**	**-0.28**	-0.01	*program closed*	***
6	Salem, VA	**-0.36**	**-0.62**	0.16	0.28	0.33
7	Atlanta, GA	**0.16**	**-0.23**	**-0.37**	**-0.26**	**-0.32**
7	Augusta, GA	-0.01	-0.02	0.08	0.07	0.09
7	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	0.38	0.25	0.24
7	Charleston, SC	**-0.21**	0.09	0.00	0.05	0.05
7	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
7	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	0.09	***
7	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-0.24**
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	-0.05	0.11	0.02	0.11	0.11
8	Bay Pines, FL	-0.12	0.34	0.30	-0.05	-0.06
8	Miami, FL	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.00
8	West Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	**-0.34**	**-0.24**	-0.09
8	N.Florida/S.Georgia VHS	*see below*	*see below*	0.29	0.07	0.14
8	Gainesville, FL	***	0.27	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Lake City, FL	***	0.13	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Tampa, FL	0.00	0.07	-0.03	0.02	**-0.46**
9	Lexington, KY	**-0.39**	**-0.45**	**-0.57**	**-0.44**	*program closed*
9	Memphis, TN	***	0.24	0.07	0.06	0.06
9	Mountain Home, TN	-0.03	0.10	0.08	0.02	0.24
9	Murfreesboro, TN	**-0.43**	**-0.48**	**-0.48**	**-0.44**	**-0.49**

Table 36a cont. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement
10	Chillicothe, OH	0.00	0.02	**-0.20**	**-0.25**	**-0.31**
10	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	0.31
10	Cleveland, OH	0.28	0.13	0.09	0.21	0.25
10	Dayton, OH	**-0.54**	***	-0.15	**-0.32**	***
11	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
11	Battle Creek, MI	-0.07	-0.05	**-0.17**	**-0.21**	**-0.22**
11	Danville, IL	-0.16	***	-0.10	**-0.26**	**-0.24**
11	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	0.24	-0.18	-0.19	-0.19
12	North Chicago, IL	-0.06	***	0.27	0.32	0.32
12	Hines, IL	-0.14	**-0.59**	**-0.34**	**-0.28**	**-0.19**
12	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
12	Tomah, WI	-0.11	0.02	0.07	**-0.59**	0.28
12	Milwaukee, WI	**-0.29**	0.02	0.10	-0.07	-0.03
13	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.05
13	Fort Meade, SD	-0.02	**-0.39**	0.39	0.44	0.37
13	Hot Springs, SD	0.46	0.42	0.30	0.36	0.29
13	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.09	**-0.34**
13	St. Cloud, MN	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.01	-0.13
14	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	0.06	0.19	***
14	Knoxville, IA	-0.08	**-0.41**	0.04	0.30	0.39
15	Columbia, MO	***	***	**-0.78**	***	***
15	Kansas City, KS	**-0.29**	0.39	0.43	0.41	***
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-0.07	***	***	***
15	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
15	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-0.19
15	Leavenworth, KS	-0.13	**-0.40**	0.24	0.21	0.28
16	Biloxi, MI	-0.16	-0.07	-0.09	-0.01	-0.11
16	Houston, TX	**-0.40**	0.32	0.26	0.27	0.21
16	Jackson, MS	***	-0.05	-0.05	0.17	0.05
16	Little Rock, AR	**-0.68**	**-0.19**	**-0.28**	**-0.31**	**-0.14**
16	Oklahoma City, OK	-0.08	-0.14	***	**-0.28**	**-0.23**
17	Dallas, TX	-0.08	0.08	-0.03	-0.10	-0.10
17	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	0.23	0.25	0.26	0.19
17	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.16
17	San Antonio, TX	0.35	0.21	0.05	0.13	-0.18
17	Temple, TX	-0.09	0.06	-0.03	0.23	0.30
17	Waco, TX	0.26	**-0.22**	***	***	0.27
18	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	**-0.33**
18	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	-0.09	0.18	0.00
18	Prescott, AZ	0.21	0.11	0.22	-0.03	0.11
18	Tucson, AZ	-0.09	-0.22	-0.02	0.01	-0.16
18	El Paso	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	Salt Lake City, UT	0.22	0.23	0.25	0.15	**-0.21**
19	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	**-0.37**	**-0.33**	0.32	***
20	Anchorage, AK	**-0.37**	-0.01	-0.02	0.03	0.02
20	Portland, OR	-0.03	0.20	0.37	0.35	0.31
20	Roseburg, OR	**-0.30**	-0.23	-0.05	0.10	**-0.27**
20	Seattle, WA	-0.20	**-0.30**	***	***	***
20	American Lake, WA	0.00	-0.05	0.19	-0.03	-0.14
20	White City, OR	-0.11	-0.03	-0.03	0.14	0.14
21	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	0.21	-0.25
21	Palo Alto, CA	***	**-0.28**	-0.17	-0.07	-0.01
21	Reno, NV	***	***	***	**-0.30**	**-0.55**
21	San Francisco, CA	-0.13	**-0.35**	-0.15	**-0.28**	**-0.51**

Table 36a cont. Adjusted Average Work Improvement, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Average Work Improvement	FY98 Average Work Improvement	FY99 Average Work Improvement	FY00 Average Work Improvement	FY01 Average Work Improvement
22	Long Beach, CA	-0.08	0.26	0.26	0.08	0.25
22	Loma Linda, CA	0.37	0.31	0.25	0.25	0.25
22	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	-0.18	-0.02	0.07
22	West LA, CA	***	***	-0.13	0.10	***
22	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***

† Average work improvement has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.
†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than eleven (11).

Table 36b. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %
1	White River Junction, VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***
1	Bedford, MA	**-32.0%**	**-32.0%**	**-26.6%**	**-32.8%**	**-34.2%**
1	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-69.3%**	**-27.4%**
1	Brockton, MA	31.1%	22.6%	-2.9%	0.0%	1.2%
1	Manchester, NH	-30.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	Northampton, MA	1.1%	6.1%	4.2%	12.9%	14.0%
1	Providence, RI	18.2%	-5.5%	**-32.7%**	24.8%	24.3%
1	West Haven, CT	**-29.2%**	-20.4%	27.4%	1.8%	8.8%
2	Buffalo, NY	-17.0%	-21.6%	**-54.6%**	-19.0%	-13.7%
2	Canandaigua, NY	40.7%	0.0%	4.7%	22.8%	-16.5%
2	Bath, NY	20.7%	65.9%	46.2%	38.7%	33.7%
2	Syracuse, NY	-19.4%	21.0%	**-42.7%**	1.2%	**-41.0%**
2	Albany, NY	**-35.6%**	-9.3%	-7.3%	-9.1%	-11.4%
3	Bronx, NY	-43.6%	38.8%	8.9%	15.1%	16.1%
3	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	21.1%	-5.0%	*see below*
3	East Orange, NJ	-24.1%	48.0%	*see above*	15.9%	24.7%
3	Lyons, NJ	9.2%	55.5%	*see above*	*see above*	13.6%
3	Montrose, NY	-23.9%	0.8%	-2.8%	*see above*	**-29.5%**
3	Brooklyn, NY	***	-3.4%	6.6%	-4.3%	**-26.1%**
3	Northport, NY	-17.1%	29.8%	-1.6%	***	-11.3%
4	Butler, PA	***	54.9%	52.7%	44.3%	47.1%
4	Coatesville, PA	27.5%	46.7%	39.8%	42.1%	35.6%
4	Lebanon, PA	0.0%	15.3%	28.5%	22.8%	30.4%
4	Philadelphia, PA	***	61.3%	57.4%	35.7%	22.3%
4	Pittsburgh, PA	**-42.0%**	9.6%	14.9%	5.3%	13.6%
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
5	Baltimore, MD	***	25.5%	31.2%	7.5%	-24.5%
5	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	16.3%	14.8%	***
5	Perry Point, MD	34.4%	-6.8%	27.5%	***	40.3%
5	Martinsburg, WV	***	***	1.2%	4.5%	18.3%
5	Washington DC	**-39.3%**	-5.1%	-1.4%	**-25.3%**	-5.8%
6	Durham, NC	55.0%	15.8%	14.2%	***	16.2%
6	Hampton, VA	11.5%	-0.7%	7.5%	3.2%	27.1%
6	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-15.2%
6	Richmond, VA	**-60.9%**	-29.0%	-30.5%	*program closed*	***
6	Salem, VA	-14.9%	**-89.9%**	28.0%	30.8%	29.6%
7	Atlanta, GA	-5.5%	**-22.6%**	**-34.4%**	-0.1%	-15.6%
7	Augusta, GA	-8.9%	-33.4%	-12.4%	-10.7%	-23.0%
7	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	50.6%	12.9%	39.3%
7	Charleston, SC	18.2%	33.5%	20.7%	29.4%	-8.1%
7	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
7	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	32.1%	***
7	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-74.0%**
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	-11.2%	11.4%	-5.3%	-6.2%	28.7%
8	Bay Pines, FL	3.7%	39.8%	35.8%	**-42.1%**	**-35.4%**
8	Miami, FL	-10.3%	-11.7%	12.6%	30.4%	16.2%
8	West Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-25.9%	-24.8%	-3.2%
8	N.Florida/S.Georgia VHS	*see below*	*see below*	31.7%	11.9%	3.8%
8	Gainesville, FL	***	57.0%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Lake City, FL	***	32.8%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Tampa, FL	-4.4%	14.2%	-2.4%	8.7%	0.4%
9	Lexington, KY	-18.7%	-23.8%	**-68.8%**	**-32.0%**	*program closed*
9	Memphis, TN	***	11.3%	20.6%	2.1%	5.3%
9	Mountain Home, TN	**-46.6%**	**-27.3%**	**-24.6%**	**-23.1%**	35.6%
9	Murfreesboro, TN	**-38.0%**	**-44.4%**	**-36.2%**	**-25.4%**	**-39.5%**

Table 36b cont. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %
10	Chillicothe, OH	2.1%	17.1%	-9.9%	-17.6%	0.0%
10	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	45.3%
10	Cleveland, OH	34.3%	16.2%	0.0%	8.2%	12.4%
10	Dayton, OH	-10.6%	***	-21.7%	0.0%	**-41.3%**
11	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
11	Battle Creek, MI	-12.5%	9.2%	-6.5%	-14.2%	-1.2%
11	Danville, IL	0.9%	***	-4.0%	-30.1%	**-41.3%**
11	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	-28.5%	**-46.7%**	**-42.6%**	**-33.6%**
12	North Chicago, IL	12.4%	***	13.4%	25.6%	27.8%
12	Hines, IL	9.1%	**-32.9%**	-11.6%	**-29.2%**	**-21.2%**
12	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
12	Tomah, WI	**-46.7%**	16.4%	5.1%	**-49.2%**	22.2%
12	Milwaukee, WI	-18.6%	11.7%	42.9%	9.4%	19.3%
13	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-4.2%
13	Fort Meade, SD	3.9%	**-47.3%**	54.4%	54.8%	48.3%
13	Hot Springs, SD	27.9%	25.1%	2.4%	-3.8%	12.8%
13	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	50.4%	48.0%
13	St. Cloud, MN	3.8%	6.9%	16.1%	2.2%	-18.2%
14	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	2.7%	45.1%	***
14	Knoxville, IA	-1.4%	**-38.1%**	9.6%	25.9%	32.9%
15	Columbia, MO	***	***	**-49.9%**	***	***
15	Kansas City, KS	**-34.6%**	9.7%	-2.0%	21.7%	***
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	52.7%	***	***	***
15	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
15	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	**-56.4%**
15	Leavenworth, KS	**-36.9%**	-2.8%	**-27.2%**	-10.8%	-17.6%
16	Biloxi, MI	**-50.4%**	32.4%	17.8%	0.6%	17.1%
16	Houston, TX	**-27.6%**	44.4%	26.7%	40.5%	23.1%
16	Jackson, MS	***	16.3%	-16.0%	**-39.7%**	**-56.8%**
16	Little Rock, AR	**-72.8%**	-4.0%	**-16.8%**	-2.8%	1.5%
16	Oklahoma City, OK	-12.6%	-2.1%	***	14.7%	-4.5%
17	Dallas, TX	-8.4%	14.0%	7.1%	-1.2%	-3.5%
17	Bonham, TX	***	-3.1%	1.7%	18.7%	27.9%
17	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-6.0%
17	San Antonio, TX	8.0%	4.4%	-14.6%	-11.9%	-19.6%
17	Temple, TX	31.2%	13.8%	-23.8%	-28.5%	11.5%
17	Waco, TX	25.6%	-2.5%	***	***	-27.8%
18	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-29.6%
18	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	**-44.0%**	-10.4%	**-40.7%**
18	Prescott, AZ	55.4%	41.7%	40.1%	18.9%	4.0%
18	Tucson, AZ	5.4%	**-26.2%**	3.3%	0.8%	**-37.5%**
18	El Paso, TX	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	Salt Lake City, UT	36.7%	-3.2%	***	30.2%	**-62.2%**
19	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-12.0%	**-57.0%**	-18.1%	***
20	Anchorage, AK	**-45.7%**	-14.3%	-9.8%	25.7%	4.9%
20	Portland, OR	3.3%	-2.3%	23.1%	44.7%	29.2%
20	Roseburg, OR	**-38.8%**	-42.2%	-19.1%	-26.1%	**-64.2%**
20	Seattle, WA	-39.0%	-32.8%	***	***	*program closed*
20	American Lake, WA	6.4%	-16.4%	4.4%	-4.3%	-31.2%
20	White City, OR	**-37.4%**	5.9%	-11.1%	10.1%	18.7%
21	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	14.5%	-21.9%
21	Palo Alto, CA	***	-15.3%	1.6%	-8.0%	-2.9%
21	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	-19.5%
21	San Francisco, CA	**-25.1%**	-19.9%	**-21.2%**	-19.9%	**-35.0%**

Table 36b cont. Adjusted Improvement in Alcohol Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY98 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY99 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY00 Alcohol Problems Improved %	FY01 Alcohol Problems Improved %
22	**Long Beach, CA**	**-39.5%**	40.9%	19.1%	-7.1%	18.9%
22	**Loma Linda, CA**	49.8%	46.5%	28.7%	22.3%	20.5%
22	**San Diego, CA**	*n.a.*	***	27.1%	6.0%	47.5%
22	**West LA, CA**	***	***	-22.7%	-9.7%	***
22	**Sepulveda, CA**	***	***	***	***	***

† Improvement in alcohol problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than eleven (11).

Table 36c. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %
1	White River Junction, VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***
1	Bedford, MA	**-26.4%**	**-28.1%**	**-20.1%**	-29.6%	**-26.0%**
1	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-64.8%	-3.9%
1	Brockton, MA	40.4%	24.7%	-12.8%	4.2%	-9.8%
1	Manchester, NH	-20.6%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	Northampton, MA	2.1%	15.0%	10.6%	14.9%	38.3%
1	Providence, RI	30.9%	0.1%	9.4%	28.7%	34.9%
1	West Haven, CT	-18.6%	-20.5%	26.0%	-9.9%	23.5%
2	Buffalo, NY	**-26.9%**	**-42.4%**	**-61.1%**	-24.8%	-7.9%
2	Canandaigua, NY	30.2%	**-31.1%**	-3.6%	7.1%	-21.0%
2	Bath, NY	47.3%	62.1%	52.5%	35.8%	36.5%
2	Syracuse, NY	-21.4%	10.3%	**-27.6%**	11.3%	**-43.4%**
2	Albany, NY	-19.9%	2.3%	-12.6%	-11.9%	0.0%
3	Bronx, NY	**-54.2%**	25.5%	-2.7%	-13.9%	5.4%
3	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	26.1%	15.0%	*see below*
3	East Orange, NJ	-22.4%	43.4%	*see above*	*see above*	11.4%
3	Lyons, NJ	15.7%	54.1%	*see above*	*see above*	10.2%
3	Montrose, NY	-15.8%	0.1%	-4.5%	-11.5%	**-30.2%**
3	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	-6.5%	-1.1%	-8.3%	**-27.0%**
3	Northport, NY	-0.2%	29.7%	12.5%	***	-10.1%
4	Butler, PA	***	49.3%	42.1%	46.2%	17.9%
4	Coatesville, PA	35.4%	47.1%	41.3%	37.0%	39.6%
4	Lebanon, PA	16.0%	21.2%	20.8%	27.3%	31.5%
4	Philadelphia, PA	***	63.7%	59.8%	36.7%	-0.2%
4	Pittsburgh, PA	**-34.7%**	5.6%	17.6%	0.0%	22.6%
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
5	Baltimore, MD	***	-4.2%	48.1%	18.7%	-16.5%
5	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	20.6%	-5.4%	
5	Perry Point, MD	10.3%	-17.1%	45.9%	***	43.0%
5	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	7.5%	6.2%	19.1%
5	Washington DC	**-44.4%**	-9.2%	-20.1%	**-50.5%**	-20.6%
6	Durham, NC	50.1%	2.4%	19.5%	***	19.8%
6	Hampton, VA	0.0%	**-17.5%**	7.5%	-6.0%	33.2%
6	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	***	-12.5%
6	Richmond, VA	**-64.3%**	-23.1%	-23.1%	*program closed*	***
6	Salem, VA	-13.5%	**-102.9%**	14.6%	27.1%	26.1%
7	Atlanta, GA	-5.4%	**-28.8%**	**-38.0%**	-0.2%	-7.9%
7	Augusta, GA	-22.9%	-30.0%	-17.99%	-12.8%	-13.4%
7	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	36.5%	19.6%	33.6%
7	Charleston, SC	40.1%	8.8%	-17.1%	32.1%	**-37.6%**
7	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
7	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	36.3%	***
7	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-90.4%**
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	-10.9%	8.7%	-11.4%	-2.1%	**-33.5%**
8	Bay Pines, FL	31.9%	48.1%	39.0%	**-26.0%**	-12.8%
8	Miami, FL	-22.4%	-21.4%	-14.8%	-2.9%	3.5%
8	West Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-28.3%	***	3.6%
8	N.Florida/S.Georgia VHS	*see below*	*see below*	16.3%	1.0%	5.8%
8	Gainesville, FL	***	49.7%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Lake City, FL	***	5.9%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Tampa, FL	-3.3%	29.2%	**-39.3%**	10.2%	-7.6%
9	Lexington, KY	-8.4%	**-26.0%**	**-47.5%**	**-41.5%**	*program closed*
9	Memphis, TN	***	11.4%	20.3%	10.0%	2.9%
9	Mountain Home, TN	**-24.3%**	**-20.7%**	**-45.4%**	**-55.6%**	39.7%
9	Murfreesboro, TN	**-32.1%**	**-44.2%**	**-32.1%**	**-23.9%**	**-37.8%**

Table 36c cont. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Drug Problems Improved %	FY98 Drug Problems Improved %	FY99 Drug Problems Improved %	FY00 Drug Problems Improved %	FY01 Drug Problems Improved %
10	Chillicothe, OH	4.1%	16.2%	3.5%	**-27.4%**	7.3%
10	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	48.5%
10	Cleveland, OH	41.4%	17.5%	6.1%	10.2%	15.3%
10	Dayton, OH	-0.5%	***	**-33.2%**	-2.7%	**-31.9%**
11	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
11	Battle Creek, MI	**-17.4%**	0.2%	-12.8%	**-24.6%**	-14.3%
11	Danville, IL	10.0%	***	-14.6%	**-34.0%**	**-31.9%**
11	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	17.8%	**-37.5%**	**-56.7%**	**-69.6%**
12	North Chicago, IL	8.9%	***	10.7%	27.6%	28.7%
12	Hines, IL	12.4%	**-33.0%**	-18.2%	**-26.6%**	**-19.8%**
12	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
12	Tomah, WI	-24.1%	12.2%	12.2%	**-42.2%**	18.1%
12	Milwaukee, WI	-6.7%	8.7%	41.0%	1.7%	6.0%
13	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-39.9%
13	Fort Meade, SD	-7.0%	**-32.7%**	33.0%	41.9%	29.3%
13	Hot Springs, SD	53.6%	28.4%	***	28.5%	39.0%
13	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	51.8%
13	St. Cloud, MN	2.6%	9.8%	2.4%	-0.8%	-12.0%
14	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	-7.6%	37.1%	***
14	Knoxville, IA	-0.8%	**-36.5%**	-1.7%	21.0%	55.5%
15	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***
15	Kansas City, KS	**-32.2%**	9.3%	4.7%	11.8%	***
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-41.1%	***	***	***
15	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
15	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	**-37.2%**
15	Leavenworth, KS	**-47.6%**	-33.1%	**-23.2%**	-9.0%	-21.5%
16	Biloxi, MI	**-38.0%**	30.3%	14.1%	20.3%	29.4%
16	Houston, TX	**-24.3%**	51.8%	31.2%	40.9%	33.8%
16	Jackson, MS	***	**-47.2%**	-32.0%	**-34.5%**	**-73.5%**
16	Little Rock, AR	**-68.2%**	-0.2%	-11.8%	-7.8%	8.1%
16	Oklahoma City, OK	34.6%	-10.3%	***	-9.6%	-7.9%
17	Dallas, TX	**-15.5%**	0.0%	-5.5%	-12.3%	-13.4%
17	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	43.0%	18.7%	19.9%	25.5%
17	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	2.4%
17	San Antonio, TX	-19.0%	-38.7%	***	7.8%	-8.4%
17	Temple, TX	20.3%	-6.0%	1.7%	-8.8%	-9.8%
17	Waco, TX	41.2%	-20.8%	***	***	-10.3%
18	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-36.9%
18	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	***	***	**-33.5%**
18	Prescott, AZ	38.2%	53.6%	52.9%	31.5%	45.6%
18	Tucson, AZ	13.3%	-43.5%	0.5%	-3.8%	**-41.2%**
18	El Paso, TX	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	Salt Lake City, UT	13.8%	61.1%	***	***	-28.4%
19	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-14.3%	-29.8%	***	***
20	Anchorage, AK	-25.7%	-13.1%	-1.7%	19.9%	16.0%
20	Portland, OR	-11.3%	26.3%	37.0%	35.5%	39.3%
20	Roseburg, OR	-21.5%	-25.0%	-17.7%	-18.6%	**-38.9%**
20	Seattle, WA	-10.9%	-54.3%	***	***	*program closed*
20	American Lake, WA	26.9%	-12.8%	6.7%	-14.7%	**-36.7%**
20	White City, OR	-21.4%	11.5%	0.0%	13.3%	18.7%
21	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	37.1%	22.0%
21	Palo Alto, CA	***	-26.1%	19.7%	0.5%	-1.4%
21	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	-37.3%
21	San Francisco, CA	-20.5%	-16.3%	**-24.9%**	**-29.2%**	**-35.9%**

Table 36c cont. Adjusted Improvement in Drug Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

		FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
		Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved	Drug Problems Improved
VISN	SITE	%	%	%	%	%
22	Long Beach, CA	-33.0%	28.7%	19.3%	-2.4%	36.0%
22	Loma Linda, CA	54.5%	45.7%	30.8%	18.3%	18.3%
22	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	***	26.8%	61.7%
22	West LA, CA	***	***	-26.6%	-4.1%	***
22	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***

† Improvement in drug problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.
†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.
*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than eleven (11).

Table 36d. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY98 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY99 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY00 Mental Health Problems Improved %	FY01 Mental Health Problems Improved %
1	White River Junction, VT	n.a.	***	***	program closed	***
1	Bedford, MA	-20.3%	-19.3%	-33.4%	-36.3%	-41.4%
1	Boston, MA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-86.8%	-42.4%
1	Brockton, MA	15.1%	14.8%	-17.3%	1.7%	-15.4%
1	Manchester, NH	-23.1%	***	program closed	program closed	program closed
1	Northampton, MA	-3.7%	4.3%	-8.5%	-26.8%	2.0%
1	Providence, RI	-19.4%	-22.8%	-7.4%	24.0%	21.3%
1	West Haven, CT	-13.0%	-9.1%	9.0%	-15.3%	-0.5%
2	Buffalo, NY	-21.7%	-14.2%	-47.6%	-45.9%	-41.7%
2	Canandaigua, NY	-2.1%	3.8%	14.3%	***	13.4%
2	Bath, NY	43.9%	79.0%	55.9%	40.3%	34.6%
2	Syracuse, NY	-11.5%	11.8%	-38.8%	-16.9%	-61.4%
2	Albany, NY	-48.4%	1.0%	-3.4%	-13.0%	-33.3%
3	Bronx, NY	-42.2%	47.9%	16.9%	-46.1%	22.1%
3	New Jersey HCS	see below	see below	-2.7%	-33.6%	see below
3	East Orange, NJ	-19.4%	65.7%	see above	see above	4.7%
3	Lyons, NJ	20.7%	61.1%	see above	see above	12.4%
3	Montrose, NY	-9.5%	-0.9%	-18.3%	-11.3%	-52.8%
3	Brooklyn, NY	n.a.	0.0%	0.0%	-12.8%	-32.8%
3	Northport, NY	-9.9%	-1.3%	-21.6%	***	-19.4%
4	Butler, PA	***	48.1%	60.5%	34.5%	37.9%
4	Coatesville, PA	16.7%	47.9%	36.5%	14.5%	19.2%
4	Lebanon, PA	2.2%	10.0%	11.4%	-35.1%	8.8%
4	Philadelphia, PA	***	71.5%	62.1%	33.2%	26.5%
4	Pittsburgh, PA	-30.5%	-10.5%	-13.5%	-11.3%	26.6%
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***
5	Baltimore, MD	***	0.3%	14.8%	-20.3%	26.9%
5	Fort Howard, MD	n.a.	***	***	***	***
5	Perry Point, MD	-10.3%	-38.2%	33.4%	***	0.8%
5	Martinsburg, WV	n.a.	***	-10.2%	-0.7%	6.0%
5	Washington DC	-33.7%	-23.7%	-29.0%	-46.8%	-16.0%
6	Durham, NC	32.2%	32.5%	***	***	49.1%
6	Hampton, VA	-7.4%	-17.9%	22.3%	-21.0%	0.0%
6	Asheville, NC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	-48.1%
6	Richmond, VA	-60.3%	-57.1%	-5.7%	program closed	***
6	Salem, VA	-28.6%	-35.8%	21.0%	17.0%	42.6%
7	Atlanta, GA	4.4%	-6.2%	-18.7%	15.7%	-11.4%
7	Augusta, GA	10.8%	-20.2%	-7.1%	-5.2%	-5.4%
7	Birmingham, AL	n.a.	n.a.	***	40.6%	50.5%
7	Charleston, SC	-0.7%	36.0%	7.6%	1.3%	-14.8%
7	Columbia, SC	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***
7	Dublin, GA	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	***	***
7	Tuskegee, AL	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-56.6%
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	4.9%	7.6%	-7.6%	-10.8%	18.8%
8	Bay Pines, FL	12.3%	63.5%	49.6%	-27.8%	-41.2%
8	Miami, FL	14.8%	-0.3%	-2.5%	0.0%	-7.5%
8	West Palm Beach, FL	n.a.	***	-31.9%	-31.6%	-21.0%
8	N.Florida/S.Georgia VHS	see below	see below	16.4%	16.4%	-3.7%
8	Gainesville, FL	***	34.0%	see above	see above	see above
8	Lake City, FL	***	-9.7%	see above	see above	see above
8	Tampa, FL	-20.7%	21.1%	-27.1%	-4.2%	-22.2%
9	Lexington, KY	-17.7%	-33.0%	-34.8%	-48.6%	program closed
9	Memphis, TN	***	8.9%	***	-0.2%	-9.7%
9	Mountain Home, TN	-21.6%	-7.4%	-36.4%	-45.7%	26.0%
9	Murfreesboro, TN	-30.4%	-31.3%	-39.3%	-52.9%	-52.4%

Table 36d cont. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

		FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
		Mental Health Problems Improved %	Mental Health Problems Improved %	Mental Health Problems Improved %	Mental Health Problems Improved %	Mental Health Problems Improved %
VISN	SITE					
10	Chillicothe, OH	0.0%	5.7%	-15.2%	**-26.7%**	-22.6%
10	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	45.2%
10	Cleveland, OH	-10.7%	12.2%	-19.2%	21.9%	31.1%
10	Dayton, OH	**-40.5%**	***	0.3%	***	-19.6%
11	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
11	Battle Creek, MI	-8.1%	7.7%	**-23.7%**	**-23.6%**	-24.5%
11	Danville, IL	24.9%	***	11.3%	-12.5%	-19.6%
11	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	31.2%	**-44.3%**	**-42.4%**	-21.4%
12	North Chicago, IL	11.6%	***	-5.8%	11.3%	7.1%
12	Hines, IL	-19.4%	**-48.3%**	**-30.4%**	**-28.8%**	**-28.7%**
12	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
12	Tomah, WI	**-34.8%**	-18.1%	7.9%	**-52.4%**	12.5%
12	Milwaukee, WI	-25.3%	4.8%	28.1%	15.7%	9.7%
13	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-59.8%**
13	Fort Meade, SD	-1.6%	**-41.1%**	53.0%	50.6%	54.0%
13	Hot Springs, SD	35.8%	60.2%	0.6%	26.2%	20.7%
13	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	44.4%	14.1%
13	St. Cloud, MN	6.9%	23.8%	-0.5%	-13.4%	-20.5%
14	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	7.6%	16.5%	
14	Knoxville, IA	5.2%	**-19.8%**	6.6%	36.7%	55.9%
15	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***
15	Kansas City, KS	**-21.5%**	21.7%	6.6%	23.8%	***
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	55.4%	***	***	***
15	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
15	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	**-45.7%**
15	Leavenworth, KS	**-39.9%**	-12.1%	-7.1%	-12.5%	-18.0%
16	Biloxi, MI	**-28.6%**	33.0%	23.3%	-16.1%	8.7%
16	Houston, TX	**-21.4%**	53.1%	34.6%	40.0%	22.9%
16	Jackson, MS	***	-15.5%	***	-10.0%	**-113.5%**
16	Little Rock, AR	**-57.1%**	-2.3%	**-23.9%**	**-33.4%**	**-25.6%**
16	Oklahoma City, OK	**-65.4%**	12.6%	***	**-75.5%**	**-60.5%**
17	Dallas, TX	**-17.1%**	6.6%	-10.1%	-12.9%	-14.3%
17	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	34.3%	29.9%	24.3%	27.9%
17	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.5%
17	San Antonio, TX	-8.3%	-14.2%	7.6%	***	-39.3%
17	Temple, TX	8.1%	-1.0%	-5.5%	***	-2.4%
17	Waco, TX	30.0%	-7.9%	***	***	26.3%
18	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	**-86.1%**
18	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	-32.0%	-22.8%	-22.3%
18	Prescott, AZ	29.9%	19.3%	35.3%	7.6%	16.1%
18	Tucson, AZ	-22.8%	**-36.3%**	-10.9%	-3.7%	**-64.4%**
18	El Paso, TX	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	Salt Lake City, UT	24.8%	44.9%	2.4%	41.5%	-19.3%
19	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-8.6%	**-48.2%**	***	***
20	Anchorage, AK	**-47.9%**	-3.2%	-16.0%	10.0%	22.0%
20	Portland, OR	**-29.1%**	**-79.9%**	50.8%	38.7%	38.3%
20	Roseburg, OR	-0.6%	**-54.6%**	-28.5%	2.7%	-27.3%
20	Seattle, WA	**-41.1%**	-10.3%	***	***	*program closed*
20	American Lake, WA	13.8%	**-24.1%**	2.9%	0.0%	-14.0%
20	White City, OR	-18.7%	17.3%	-13.0%	1.9%	17.8%
21	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	28.2%	-26.6%
21	Palo Alto, CA	***	**-26.7%**	-25.8%	-26.4%	-1.3%
21	Reno, NV	***	***	***	5.3%	**-49.4%**
21	San Francisco, CA	-19.0%	-16.8%	**-34.5%**	**-53.0%**	**-54.8%**

Table 36d cont. Adjusted Improvement in Mental Health Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

| | | FY96 | FY98 | FY99 | FY00 | FY01 |
| | | Mental Health Problems Improved % | Mental Health Problems Improved % | Mental Health Problems Improved % | Mental Health Problems Improved % | Mental Health Problems Improved % |
VISN	SITE					
22	Long Beach, CA	18.4%	54.9%	32.1%	-5.0%	31.2%
22	Loma Linda, CA	37.8%	52.7%	16.3%	21.3%	-1.5%
22	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	**-46.3%**	-12.7%	1.1%
22	West LA, CA	***	***	-22.8%	-20.0%	***
22	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***

† Improvement in mental health problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.
†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.
*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than eleven (11).

Table 36e. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Medical Problems Improved %	FY98 Medical Problems Improved %	FY99 Medical Problems Improved %	FY00 Medical Problems Improved %	FY01 Medical Problems Improved %
1	White River Junction, VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***
1	Bedford, MA	-8.8%	-1.7%	-7.9%	**-11.5%**	**-17.6%**
1	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-20.7%	-0.8%
1	Brockton, MA	26.2%	24.2%	-5.8%	12.0%	3.8%
1	Manchester, NH	**-33.8%**	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	Northampton, MA	1.6%	18.9%	0.0%	-11.5%	0.0%
1	Providence, RI	2.2%	13.2%	0.0%	20.3%	50.1%
1	West Haven, CT	-18.6%	-3.9%	20.3%	0.9%	14.9%
2	Buffalo, NY	-19.3%	-12.2%	**-27.1%**	**-35.7%**	-16.2%
2	Canandaigua, NY	17.7%	13.4%	15.3%	***	40.1%
2	Bath, NY	26.4%	-104.6%	76.2%	63.2%	58.0%
2	Syracuse, NY	**-27.8%**	19.6%	-9.0%	0.2%	**-53.2%**
2	Albany, NY	**-26.9%**	1.6%	-11.1%	-12.1%	-14.3%
3	Bronx, NY	-7.9%	96.7%	***	**-54.8%**	**-40.1%**
3	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	10.9%	-1.1%	*see below*
3	East Orange, NJ	1.9%	75.3%	*see above*	*see above*	-10.0%
3	Lyons, NJ	-9.5%	80.6%	*see above*	*see above*	59.3%
3	Montrose, NY	-12.1%	4.3%	-12.0%	1.6%	-16.6%
3	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	-4.2%	-1.9%	15.9%	-18.2%
3	Northport, NY	-23.2%	26.7%	5.8%	***	5.2%
4	Butler, PA	***	29.3%	***	21.5%	-1.5%
4	Coatesville, PA	-5.2%	42.5%	50.5%	9.7%	26.8%
4	Lebanon, PA	**-30.3%**	3.3%	-13.5%	-24.6%	-18.6%
4	Philadelphia, PA	***	87.6%	79.5%	65.9%	80.0%
4	Pittsburgh, PA	**-28.4%**	-8.8%	**-27.3%**	**-22.9%**	31.7%
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
5	Baltimore, MD	***	-2.5%	18.0%	***	**-46.7%**
5	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
5	Perry Point, MD	18.6%	-10.4%	-14.9%	***	-18.5%
5	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-5.7%	27.7%	17.1%
5	Washington DC	**-23.0%**	1.0%	-21.4%	**-32.1%**	17.8%
6	Durham, NC	-5.3%	15.2%	16.5%	***	65.2%
6	Hampton, VA	-3.7%	-4.2%	-6.9%	**-21.2%**	**-21.7%**
6	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-33.2%
6	Richmond, VA	**-26.1%**	-18.7%	-11.9%	*program closed*	***
6	Salem, VA	-24.9%	-16.6%	42.2%	69.5%	75.3%
7	Atlanta, GA	4.2%	0.0%	11.8%	10.9%	-7.3%
7	Augusta, GA	-7.0%	-11.3%	4.1%	-24.9%	9.9%
7	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	70.2%	60.9%	72.6%
7	Charleston, SC	-5.9%	18.3%	2.0%	6.5%	-1.3%
7	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
7	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***
7	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-46.4%
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	9.6%	28.9%	-9.4%	18.1%	0.2%
8	Bay Pines, FL	**-19.5%**	74.0%	67.4%	**-21.0%**	0.7%
8	Miami, FL	-15.8%	6.7%	12.5%	-0.5%	**-28.7%**
8	West Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	***	**-46.6%**	**-47.6%**
8	N.Florida/S.Georgia VHS	*see below*	*see below*	-2.1%	12.0%	9.2%
8	Gainesville, FL	***	11.7%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Lake City, FL	***	-4.6%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Tampa, FL	-0.6%	26.4%	2.7%	-11.1%	6.7%
9	Lexington, KY	-16.1%	-16.7%	**-33.7%**	**-24.5%**	*program closed*
9	Memphis, TN	***	30.0%	30.1%	26.5%	-2.3%
9	Mountain Home, TN	-9.2%	1.4%	**-21.4%**	**-33.3%**	32.2%
9	Murfreesboro, TN	-11.6%	-11.7%	**-19.4%**	**-29.0%**	**-31.1%**

Table 36e cont. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

		FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
		Medical Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved
VISN	SITE	%	%	%	%	%
10	Chillicothe, OH	4.9%	3.2%	-16.3%	-15.2%	-7.9%
10	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	70.3%
10	Cleveland, OH	6.7%	3.3%	-18.8%	***	21.3%
10	Dayton, OH	3.9%	***	-5.1%	***	-29.5%
11	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
11	Battle Creek, MI	5.2%	13.5%	-0.7%	-12.2%	-3.7%
11	Danville, IL	-11.0%	***	20.8%	-1.2%	-29.5%
11	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	13.3%	-22.9%	-19.2%	-50.5%
12	North Chicago, IL	15.0%	***	30.9%	18.2%	7.0%
12	Hines, IL	6.0%	-25.6%	-18.8%	-23.2%	-15.3%
12	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
12	Tomah, WI	0.0%	30.7%	38.4%	-19.9%	46.8%
12	Milwaukee, WI	-19.3%	30.1%	26.8%	21.2%	23.2%
13	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-21.0%
13	Fort Meade, SD	12.3%	-1.1%	43.7%	71.3%	81.2%
13	Hot Springs, SD	26.6%	37.9%	***	69.2%	32.4%
13	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-11.2%	-20.0%
13	St. Cloud, MN	9.2%	31.3%	1.2%	0.0%	-4.9%
14	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	2.3%	39.9%	
14	Knoxville, IA	11.9%	-12.8%	16.1%	45.5%	77.0%
15	Columbia, MO	***	***	***	***	***
15	Kansas City, KS	-8.3%	59.2%	33.1%	42.6%	***
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	68.3%	***	***	***
15	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
15	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	3.1%
15	Leavenworth, KS	2.1%	17.2%	30.4%	24.0%	12.9%
16	Biloxi, MI	-16.6%	4.5%	27.1%	11.3%	20.8%
16	Houston, TX	-22.3%	50.4%	33.7%	36.6%	46.5%
16	Jackson, MS	***	27.7%	-18.8%	-5.9%	-31.8%
16	Little Rock, AR	-15.2%	6.3%	-13.5%	-12.9%	-12.1%
16	Oklahoma City, OK	47.9%	-28.0%	***	-64.6%	-39.0%
17	Dallas, TX	-0.1%	10.6%	-5.6%	-4.5%	4.3%
17	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	45.8%	41.9%	57.8%	46.4%
17	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	21.9%
17	San Antonio, TX	-13.9%	33.7%	29.0%	-8.4%	-91.5%
17	Temple, TX	15.6%	2.5%	***	***	-2.8%
17	Waco, TX	12.5%	3.8%	***	***	7.6%
18	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-22.3%
18	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	***	***	-2.9%
18	Prescott, AZ	29.7%	60.6%	51.5%	62.6%	47.0%
18	Tucson, AZ	-25.7%	-11.0%	-17.1%	17.5%	-11.6%
18	El Paso, TX	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	Salt Lake City, UT	18.8%	-4.4%	-35.4%	-6.6%	-13.4%
19	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-2.6%	-21.2%	***	***
20	Anchorage, AK	-13.2%	19.0%	9.1%	18.2%	34.5%
20	Portland, OR	-26.6%	21.9%	54.4%	68.8%	60.1%
20	Roseburg, OR	-18.1%	-36.6%	-2.7%	10.1%	-16.9%
20	Seattle, WA	-9.1%	-12.2%	***	***	*program closed*
20	American Lake, WA	-2.7%	1.6%	27.4%	25.1%	14.7%
20	White City, OR	-5.0%	16.3%	17.4%	32.5%	29.7%
21	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	***	-32.2%
21	Palo Alto, CA	***	4.5%	-17.3%	-14.2%	10.4%
21	Reno, NV	***	***	***	***	6.2%
21	San Francisco, CA	-10.3%	-20.8%	-16.0%	-23.1%	-42.4%

Table 36e cont. Adjusted Improvement in Medical Problems, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

		FY96	FY98	FY99	FY00	FY01
		Medical Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved	Medical Problems Improved
VISN	SITE	%	%	%	%	%
22	**Long Beach, CA**	-4.7%	34.6%	36.8%	20.6%	45.6%
22	**Loma Linda, CA**	12.1%	39.5%	15.0%	27.7%	27.0%
22	**San Diego, CA**	*n.a.*	***	-22.7%	2.1%	15.6%
22	**West LA, CA**	***	***	6.9%	11.6%	***
22	**Sepulveda, CA**	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***

† Improvement in medical problems has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than eleven (11).

Table 36f. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
1	White River Junction, VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***
1	Bedford, MA	**-31.9%**	**-25.8%**	**-14.0%**	**-9.6%**	**-12.5%**
1	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-7.3%	22.2%
1	Brockton, MA	1.3%	-8.8%	-9.7%	-11.7%	**-24.5%**
1	Manchester, NH	-8.3%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	Northampton, MA	-0.2%	**-15.2%**	-4.3%	6.4%	15.1%
1	Providence, RI	**-18.4%**	**-22.0%**	**-18.6%**	-14.3%	**-24.0%**
1	West Haven, CT	-3.5%	-7.7%	25.8%	1.7%	6.7%
2	Buffalo, NY	-9.8%	-12.1%	-10.5%	-11.1%	-2.1%
2	Canandaigua, NY	-4.8%	**-21.4%**	**-18.2%**	2.5%	9.0%
2	Bath, NY	4.8%	**-43.5%**	-1.4%	11.8%	20.2%
2	Syracuse, NY	**-16.4%**	-10.5%	-1.5%	8.0%	-4.4%
2	Albany, NY	**-16.7%**	-8.9%	-2.2%	2.6%	13.4%
3	Bronx, NY	-23.8%	10.0%	-7.6%	-3.7%	0.6%
3	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	14.9%	11.8%	*see below*
3	East Orange, NJ	-4.1%	20.1%	*see above*	*see above*	15.2%
3	Lyons, NJ	9.8%	**20.1%**	*see above*	*see above*	12.6%
3	Montrose, NY	5.6%	**-13.1%**	**-12.4%**	-5.1%	**-10.9%**
3	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	4.7%	23.3%	2.9%	-5.6%
3	Northport, NY	-12.8%	-3.9%	9.6%	***	**-17.1%**
4	Butler, PA	***	-3.6%	-10.9%	-1.8%	-4.7%
4	Coatesville, PA	-5.4%	21.6%	2.2%	**-9.3%**	10.4%
4	Lebanon, PA	1.6%	-2.3%	0.5%	4.7%	9.3%
4	Philadelphia, PA	***	-6.6%	31.2%	**-19.2%**	-1.6%
4	Pittsburgh, PA	-0.9%	-10.0%	1.7%	**-12.8%**	-4.7%
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
5	Baltimore, MD	***	-6.0%	-9.0%	10.3%	**-34.9%**
5	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	21.9%	14.3%	***
5	Perry Point, MD	23.9%	-6.3%	-12.0%	***	**-16.9%**
5	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	21.2%	6.4%	-6.0%
5	Washington DC	20.3%	-15.2%	8.6%	1.3%	7.4%
6	Durham, NC	29.9%	9.3%	5.2%	-4.0%	-7.7%
6	Hampton, VA	20.0%	-10.3%	3.3%	7.1%	15.0%
6	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	11.6%
6	Richmond, VA	**-24.9%**	3.4%	-18.5%	*program closed*	***
6	Salem, VA	**-20.9%**	-6.0%	-2.8%	-11.5%	-11.2%
7	Atlanta, GA	-1.7%	-9.7%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%
7	Augusta, GA	**-23.9%**	**-24.2%**	3.0%	-7.8%	-11.5%
7	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	21.4%	16.0%	21.1%
7	Charleston, SC	-5.6%	11.1%	2.4%	17.1%	-11.3%
7	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
7	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	9.6%	***
7	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**-35.3%**
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.0%	-10.5%	-5.7%	-10.8%	-1.9%
8	Bay Pines, FL	-1.0%	-7.9%	-4.8%	**-9.6%**	-7.6%
8	Miami, FL	14.9%	-18.7%	-11.8%	11.0%	17.9%
8	West Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-3.9%	15.1%	17.9%
8	N.Florida/S.Georgia VHS	*see below*	*see below*	10.3%	10.2%	10.7%
8	Gainesville, FL	***	13.8%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Lake City, FL	***	9.4%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Tampa, FL	-4.8%	10.0%	4.8%	11.5%	28.4%
9	Lexington, KY	**-13.3%**	**-22.8%**	-6.5%	**-18.4%**	*program closed*
9	Memphis, TN	***	-12.8%	0.2%	-11.6%	2.4%
9	Mountain Home, TN	-5.0%	**-25.1%**	**-11.0%**	**-11.3%**	-8.0%
9	Murfreesboro, TN	-6.6%	-11.5%	-5.2%	**-12.5%**	-9.3%

Table 36f cont. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
10	Chillicothe, OH	-5.9%	9.4%	-2.2%	7.7%	7.9%
10	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	40.8%
10	Cleveland, OH	-0.4%	-2.3%	10.3%	-2.6%	-3.4%
10	Dayton, OH	6.9%	***	10.3%	-6.9%	-9.0%
11	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
11	Battle Creek, MI	-7.3%	-4.6%	-0.2%	-4.8%	-4.9%
11	Danville, IL	**-26.9%**	***	8.3%	-18.4%	-9.0%
11	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	14.6%	-17.0%	-5.4%	-3.6%
12	North Chicago, IL	**-16.4%**	***	13.6%	22.4%	14.6%
12	Hines, IL	2.8%	**-28.3%**	4.0%	5.0%	0.2%
12	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
12	Tomah, WI	-10.0%	**-23.8%**	1.6%	**-23.1%**	-7.6%
12	Milwaukee, WI	12.0%	**-17.7%**	-6.3%	-3.4%	-5.0%
13	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-9.4%
13	Fort Meade, SD	-12.7%	**-30.7%**	4.7%	12.4%	6.9%
13	Hot Springs, SD	-4.4%	-12.1%	-11.0%	-7.6%	1.7%
13	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	21.6%	20.2%
13	St. Cloud, MN	-1.8%	-5.2%	6.5%	-5.6%	-9.4%
14	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	5.7%	13.5%	***
14	Knoxville, IA	**-18.7%**	0.9%	5.3%	6.6%	21.5%
15	Columbia, MO	***	***	-7.9%	***	***
15	Kansas City, KS	**-19.1%**	-9.8%	-7.2%	-7.3%	***
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	0.0%	***	***	***
15	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
15	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	-16.9%
15	Leavenworth, KS	**-22.2%**	-6.3%	-6.8%	-12.9%	5.0%
16	Biloxi, MI	**-20.2%**	-9.2%	7.6%	-4.7%	4.5%
16	Houston, TX	5.6%	16.2%	3.5%	11.1%	8.0%
16	Jackson, MS	***	-20.4%	-11.3%	-8.4%	-4.8%
16	Little Rock, AR	-19.5%	-5.0%	2.1%	0.0%	6.0%
16	Oklahoma City, OK	-18.1%	**-27.2%**	***	**-30.8%**	-13.3%
17	Dallas, TX	**-21.1%**	**-21.7%**	**-25.5%**	**-17.1%**	**-19.4%**
17	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	-1.1%	2.1%	-9.0%	7.1%
17	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-10.7%
17	San Antonio, TX	-1.9%	-17.0%	14.3%	-3.8%	-14.7%
17	Temple, TX	-9.1%	**-30.2%**	**-24.8%**	**-20.0%**	27.4%
17	Waco, TX	4.3%	**-18.8%**	***	***	-13.7%
18	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-4.7%
18	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	5.2%	21.7%	14.7%
18	Prescott, AZ	-8.6%	-12.9%	5.9%	-2.0%	-1.1%
18	Tucson, AZ	-8.5%	**-29.7%**	-0.6%	9.6%	-7.5%
18	El Paso, TX	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	Salt Lake City, UT	14.1%	18.4%	13.9%	30.2%	7.7%
19	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-12.0%	-26.8%	5.8%	***
20	Anchorage, AK	-13.8%	-10.2%	-13.5%	20.2%	-4.3%
20	Portland, OR	-10.5%	**-25.7%**	-0.5%	2.7%	-6.6%
20	Roseburg, OR	-3.2%	**-34.5%**	-5.4%	-10.7%	**-29.4%**
20	Seattle, WA	17.8%	**-36.0%**	***	***	*program closed*
20	American Lake, WA	0.9%	-9.3%	8.3%	11.7%	-7.3%
20	White City, OR	11.1%	0.7%	5.5%	1.5%	5.2%
21	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	18.6%	1.9%
21	Palo Alto, CA	***	**-17.7%**	3.6%	2.7%	15.0%
21	Reno, NV	***	***	***	-15.0%	-9.6%
21	San Francisco, CA	6.1%	-1.7%	-1.6%	-3.7%	**-19.4%**

Table 36f cont. Adjusted Competitively Employed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY98 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY99 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY00 Competitively Employed at Discharge %	FY01 Competitively Employed at Discharge %
22	Long Beach, CA	-7.9%	5.2%	22.5%	0.6%	28.8%
22	Loma Linda, CA	24.1%	8.5%	-4.7%	**-13.2%**	6.9%
22	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	-6.3%	16.4%	16.0%
22	West LA, CA	***	***	**-25.5%**	16.4%	***
22	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***

† Improvement in competitive employment situation has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than eleven (11).

Table 36g. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %
1	White River Junction, VT	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***
1	Bedford, MA	-8.9%	0.6%	6.9%	**16.3%**	9.3%
1	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**23.8%**	-5.3%
1	Brockton, MA	7.6%	-10.4%	-2.8%	2.9%	4.5%
1	Manchester, NH	11.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	Northampton, MA	2.8%	9.2%	-1.8%	-2.0%	-5.7%
1	Providence, RI	-5.7%	-6.9%	-10.7%	-7.0%	1.1%
1	West Haven, CT	-13.5%	0.5%	-4.6%	-7.1%	-9.7%
2	Buffalo, NY	**31.7%**	**18.9%**	**25.2%**	**16.7%**	8.5%
2	Canandaigua, NY	-18.1%	7.3%	0.0%	-16.3%	-17.4%
2	Bath, NY	**17.4%**	15.2%	-8.5%	-3.4%	-17.6%
2	Syracuse, NY	6.8%	10.9%	11.4%	-4.8%	**16.7%**
2	Albany, NY	13.1%	-3.5%	-15.3%	-10.0%	-15.6%
3	Bronx, NY	**43.6%**	0.0%	**17.6%**	**23.5%**	9.8%
3	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	-3.5%	-1.4%	*see below*
3	East Orange, NJ	**26.7%**	-6.8%	*see above*	*see above*	-25.5%
3	Lyons, NJ	0.9%	-10.3%	*see above*	*see above*	-17.0%
3	Montrose, NY	7.1%	0.8%	8.0%	0.0%	-2.2%
3	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	8.8%	5.3%	**21.5%**	9.2%
3	Northport, NY	**26.2%**	1.9%	9.1%	***	7.8%
4	Butler, PA	***	**22.9%**	**36.6%**	**15.4%**	13.4%
4	Coatesville, PA	-3.3%	0.4%	8.0%	-13.9%	-20.0%
4	Lebanon, PA	**17.4%**	**24.5%**	**27.2%**	**21.5%**	14.0%
4	Philadelphia, PA	***	**30.3%**	2.6%	**56.0%**	**34.0%**
4	Pittsburgh, PA	0.0%	-2.2%	-6.3%	0.9%	-10.6%
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
5	Baltimore, MD	***	**21.1%**	**23.8%**	16.6%	14.4%
5	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	-15.0%	15.9%	***
5	Perry Point, MD	-4.9%	15.7%	11.0%	***	8.5%
5	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-14.7%	-0.6%	-12.4%
5	Washington DC	0.5%	**39.4%**	12.4%	**21.6%**	**16.1%**
6	Durham, NC	-13.9%	-16.2%	-13.0%	-18.4%	-15.9%
6	Hampton, VA	-9.4%	**16.9%**	-3.2%	12.8%	-6.7%
6	Asheville, NC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-13.2%
6	Richmond, VA	**41.6%**	4.2%	**32.4%**	*program closed*	***
6	Salem, VA	14.8%	-0.8%	**20.6%**	**38.4%**	**17.7%**
7	Atlanta, GA	-17.6%	-15.9%	-8.5%	-18.5%	-10.0%
7	Augusta, GA	-18.9%	-3.4%	-2.3%	-6.3%	-1.5%
7	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-12.1%	-13.7%	-22.9%
7	Charleston, SC	-4.3%	-14.5%	-11.4%	-19.7%	-18.1%
7	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
7	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-12.1%	***
7	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**26.6%**
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	0.4%	9.1%	6.0%	**16.0%**	4.6%
8	Bay Pines, FL	2.3%	-6.4%	-6.6%	**11.0%**	-9.1%
8	Miami, FL	-7.1%	-13.3%	-9.6%	-8.2%	-12.8%
8	West Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	-7.3%	4.4%	-26.4%
8	N.Florida/S.Georgia VHS	*see below*	*see below*	-8.8%	-14.3%	-23.8%
8	Gainesville, FL	***	-2.9%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Lake City, FL	***	-2.6%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Tampa, FL	10.5%	-18.2%	-19.6%	-9.5%	-20.0%
9	Lexington, KY	-6.3%	7.0%	3.9%	11.6%	*program closed*
9	Memphis, TN	***	**25.0%**	-1.6%	4.6%	-7.7%
9	Mountain Home, TN	-1.8%	**15.3%**	6.0%	8.7%	4.2%
9	Murfreesboro, TN	1.9%	**22.9%**	**20.4%**	**20.4%**	13.4%

Table 36g cont. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %
10	Chillicothe, OH	-1.4%	-12.7%	2.4%	2.9%	6.6%
10	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-21.4%
10	Cleveland, OH	**22.7%**	7.5%	0.7%	**25.6%**	**17.4%**
10	Dayton, OH	-14.1%	***	0.2%	-1.1%	-5.6%
11	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
11	Battle Creek, MI	**11.5%**	11.7%	12.2%	11.6%	11.9%
11	Danville, IL	**16.8%**	***	-18.4%	**19.1%**	-5.6%
11	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	-4.1%	1.0%	9.4%	7.6%
12	North Chicago, IL	-5.2%	***	9.2%	5.0%	5.3%
12	Hines, IL	-17.6%	7.8%	-0.9%	5.8%	-4.3%
12	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
12	Tomah, WI	**16.7%**	7.5%	-2.3%	**28.1%**	12.3%
12	Milwaukee, WI	7.9%	4.7%	3.4%	2.0%	8.3%
13	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	19.5%
13	Fort Meade, SD	4.4%	0.4%	-16.6%	-7.8%	-12.9%
13	Hot Springs, SD	**17.4%**	10.2%	**18.8%**	12.5%	9.4%
13	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-5.7%	-26.0%
13	St. Cloud, MN	-0.5%	**10.4%**	0.9%	8.1%	**15.4%**
14	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	-2.6%	-11.8%	***
14	Knoxville, IA	4.8%	-12.0%	-2.4%	-4.9%	-20.8%
15	Columbia, MO	***	***	18.2%	***	***
15	Kansas City, KS	-0.5%	**20.3%**	**32.1%**	**23.5%**	***
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	-2.4%	***	***	***
15	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
15	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	19.0%
15	Leavenworth, KS	**19.9%**	0.1%	-9.0%	0.1%	-2.6%
16	Biloxi, MI	**35.5%**	**15.8%**	10.4%	**28.1%**	**15.3%**
16	Houston, TX	-12.7%	-12.1%	-6.6%	-4.9%	-15.4%
16	Jackson, MS	***	**30.6%**	**28.6%**	-4.0%	**18.3%**
16	Little Rock, AR	-3.1%	8.5%	9.9%	**12.6%**	10.7%
16	Oklahoma City, OK	**24.8%**	-10.0%	***	4.5%	-1.3%
17	Dallas, TX	6.2%	3.6%	6.9%	**20.1%**	**12.5%**
17	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	-1.2%	-1.8%	3.4%	0.5%
17	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	**17.8%**
17	San Antonio, TX	12.8%	11.4%	1.4%	13.3%	-19.3%
17	Temple, TX	-2.0%	**28.2%**	**37.3%**	2.3%	-24.8%
17	Waco, TX	6.3%	-2.9%	***	***	10.6%
18	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	20.6%
18	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	-6.6%	-8.7%	-7.7%
18	Prescott, AZ	**22.8%**	**37.8%**	**24.4%**	**22.0%**	**28.9%**
18	Tucson, AZ	-4.9%	3.8%	-3.2%	-3.9%	0.0%
18	El Paso, TX	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	Salt Lake City, UT	-18.9%	-9.0%	-18.7%	-20.1%	-14.6%
19	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	-3.3%	21.1%	-20.7%	***
20	Anchorage, AK	**26.3%**	**21.0%**	-3.5%	-4.7%	-7.8%
20	Portland, OR	**18.8%**	**26.3%**	11.7%	-4.9%	8.3%
20	Roseburg, OR	11.0%	**28.0%**	**19.0%**	**20.5%**	**52.9%**
20	Seattle, WA	-6.6%	21.0%	***	***	*program closed*
20	American Lake, WA	**13.1%**	**14.2%**	-0.9%	-0.5%	0.5%
20	White City, OR	-6.7%	3.0%	-3.7%	**11.6%**	-14.0%
21	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	-12.9%	6.4%
21	Palo Alto, CA	***	**30.4%**	2.9%	-3.1%	1.7%
21	Reno, NV	***	***	***	-11.2%	-6.2%
21	San Francisco, CA	4.0%	6.7%	**14.2%**	1.6%	2.1%

Table 36g cont. Adjusted Unemployed at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY98 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY99 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY00 Unemployed at Discharge %	FY01 Unemployed at Discharge %
22	Long Beach, CA	15.8%	-2.0%	-3.5%	4.7%	-7.9%
22	Loma Linda, CA	-22.6%	-10.2%	-6.3%	-8.6%	-19.9%
22	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	-23.8%	-4.7%	-20.0%
22	West LA, CA	***	***	1.1%	-5.8%	***
22	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***

† Improvement in unemployment has been adjusted for veteran characteristics which vary within each fiscal year.
†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and direction from the median site.

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than eleven (11).

Table 36h. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
1	White River Junction	*n.a.*	***	***	*program closed*	***
1	Bedford, MA	53.6%	42.8%	22.6%	14.4%	17.6%
1	Boston, MA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-14.3%	-9.7%
1	Brockton, MA	-2.7%	6.9%	5.8%	4.8%	10.0%
1	Manchester, NH	-6.1%	***	*program closed*	*program closed*	*program closed*
1	Northampton, MA	4.5%	15.1%	13.3%	5.1%	1.7%
1	Providence, RI	13.8%	17.4%	6.1%	-2.8%	-3.7%
1	West Haven, CT	17.6%	10.6%	-7.3%	6.1%	0.0%
2	Buffalo, NY	-11.1%	-5.4%	-7.5%	-8.9%	2.8%
2	Canandaigua, NY	28.2%	20.9%	8.0%	8.6%	0.9%
2	Bath, NY	-14.7%	49.5%	-7.9%	-2.6%	-3.4%
2	Syracuse, NY	-8.2%	-0.6%	4.8%	-4.8%	-8.8%
2	Albany, NY	4.6%	12.4%	19.4%	7.6%	-2.0%
3	Bronx, NY	-5.8%	-9.7%	-10.9%	-13.2%	-12.0%
3	New Jersey HCS	*see below*	*see below*	0.1%	1.9%	*see below*
3	East Orange, NJ	-15.1%	-2.3%	*see above*	*see above*	-2.3%
3	Lyons, NJ	-0.6%	0.0%	*see above*	*see above*	2.0%
3	Montrose, NY	1.9%	11.8%	9.9%	8.9%	12.4%
3	Brooklyn, NY	*n.a.*	-4.7%	-13.0%	-12.7%	4.3%
3	Northport, NY	-4.5%	19.4%	-10.6%	-15.2%	25.5%
4	Butler, PA	***	-5.1%	-13.2%	-13.9%	-11.6%
4	Coatesville, PA	0.9%	-8.1%	-11.4%	8.6%	18.8%
4	Lebanon, PA	-11.1%	-4.7%	-11.3%	-11.7%	-9.6%
4	Philadelphia, PA	***	-10.2%	-13.9%	-14.0%	-12.5%
4	Pittsburgh, PA	-1.8%	10.8%	0.9%	6.9%	2.2%
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
5	Baltimore, MD	***	-10.0%	-6.7%	-13.0%	4.2%
5	Fort Howard, MD	*n.a.*	***	-12.9%	-14.1%	***
5	Perry Point, MD	-8.2%	13.7%	-10.8%	17.2%	-7.0%
5	Martinsburg, WV	*n.a.*	***	-5.6%	-10.5%	0.5%
5	Washington DC	-8.3%	-9.4%	-13.1%	-13.4%	-12.2%
6	Durham, NC	-2.3%	3.2%	-3.1%	13.2%	7.4%
6	Hampton, VA	0.0%	-2.9%	-3.0%	-3.5%	-3.5%
6	Asheville, NC	***	***	***	34.3%	9.2%
6	Richmond, VA	-11.4%	4.0%	-12.9%	*program closed*	***
6	Salem, VA	18.1%	5.0%	-12.7%	-12.8%	-10.0%
7	Atlanta, GA	28.5%	34.8%	22.4%	28.5%	18.0%
7	Augusta, GA	-5.9%	19.4%	5.7%	0.2%	-6.0%
7	Birmingham, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-8.8%	6.2%	8.7%
7	Charleston, SC	20.6%	17.5%	12.9%	-1.6%	4.3%
7	Columbia, SC	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
7	Dublin, GA	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	1.1%	***
7	Tuskegee, AL	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	21.7%
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	2.7%	13.6%	8.2%	2.1%	-3.6%
8	Bay Pines, FL	1.5%	18.7%	19.0%	-0.4%	16.9%
8	Miami, FL	-6.9%	24.1%	11.8%	2.7%	1.1%
8	West Palm Beach, FL	*n.a.*	***	24.2%	-4.6%	-0.7%
8	N.Florida/S.Georgia VHS	*see below*	*see below*	5.0%	9.3%	7.4%
8	Gainesville, FL	***	5.1%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Lake City, FL	***	-1.6%	*see above*	*see above*	*see above*
8	Tampa, FL	1.3%	11.4%	15.8%	3.1%	3.8%
9	Lexington, KY	14.9%	23.3%	11.9%	-0.6%	*program closed*
9	Memphis, TN	***	-1.6%	2.9%	5.6%	6.8%
9	Mountain Home, TN	12.5%	19.9%	19.1%	11.1%	10.5%
9	Murfreesboro, TN	12.8%	-0.4%	-8.8%	-9.6%	-10.6%

113

Table 36h cont. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
10	Chillicothe, OH	2.3%	-0.1%	-1.5%	-8.2%	-3.7%
10	Cincinnati, OH	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-10.5%
10	Cleveland, OH	-10.1%	5.7%	-0.8%	-7.6%	-9.4%
10	Dayton, OH	15.6%	***	2.0%	-13.3%	1.5%
11	Ann Arbor, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	***	***
11	Battle Creek, MI	1.0%	-2.4%	-6.1%	-11.9%	-10.6%
11	Danville, IL	**21.8%**	***	5.2%	**17.6%**	1.5%
11	Indianapolis, IN	*n.a.*	-0.4%	2.4%	-0.8%	-9.0%
12	North Chicago, IL	**41.8%**	***	-8.2%	-13.1%	-10.9%
12	Hines, IL	**18.3%**	**28.0%**	10.5%	-2.0%	**12.2%**
12	Iron Mountain, MI	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
12	Tomah, WI	-2.0%	0.6%	-3.1%	-7.3%	-11.8%
12	Milwaukee, WI	-10.1%	4.3%	-5.9%	-2.9%	0.5%
13	Sioux Falls, SD	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-0.4%
13	Fort Meade, SD	**18.9%**	**27.7%**	1.6%	-5.6%	-2.0%
13	Hot Springs, SD	-6.3%	-1.3%	-10.3%	-8.6%	-7.0%
13	Minneapolis, MN	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-5.4%	13.4%
13	St. Cloud, MN	**15.5%**	**8.2%**	4.5%	-0.6%	1.2%
14	Des Moines, IA	*n.a.*	***	2.6%	-9.0%	***
14	Knoxville, IA	**22.3%**	**10.9%**	-1.1%	5.7%	16.2%
15	Columbia, MO	***	***	8.0%	***	***
15	Kansas City, KS	**26.2%**	-6.3%	-9.2%	0.0%	***
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	***	**36.8%**	***	***	***
15	St. Louis, MO	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***
15	Topeka, KS	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	*see below*	5.5%
15	Leavenworth, KS	11.7%	9.6%	**22.8%**	**17.2%**	9.3%
16	Biloxi, MI	-6.9%	2.4%	-2.1%	-5.1%	-8.0%
16	Houston, TX	2.6%	-2.2%	2.9%	-2.5%	3.2%
16	Jackson, MS	***	-4.5%	-4.3%	11.5%	-4.8%
16	Little Rock, AR	17.1%	-3.8%	-5.4%	-11.7%	-10.2%
16	Oklahoma City, OK	-0.9%	**48.3%**	***	**33.4%**	**23.0%**
17	Dallas, TX	**10.1%**	**15.4%**	**15.8%**	5.2%	**10.7%**
17	Bonham, TX	*n.a.*	-1.1%	-6.8%	-5.5%	-7.0%
17	Fort Worth, TX	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	-3.6%
17	San Antonio, TX	-11.8%	4.6%	3.6%	-0.2%	14.5%
17	Temple, TX	13.5%	**18.2%**	0.0%	**24.5%**	9.4%
17	Waco, TX	-4.4%	**16.5%**	***	***	5.7%
18	Albuquerque, NM	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	***	-12.4%
18	Phoenix, AZ	*n.a.*	***	-7.7%	-1.2%	-2.7%
18	Prescott, AZ	-7.5%	-4.0%	-10.2%	-0.6%	-9.4%
18	Tucson, AZ	14.1%	**27.3%**	8.3%	9.8%	5.6%
18	El Paso, TX	*n.a.*	***	***	***	***
19	Salt Lake City, UT	9.6%	0.6%	-5.7%	8.6%	-5.4%
19	Sheridan, WY	*n.a.*	8.3%	5.3%	**41.1%**	***
20	Anchorage, AK	0.0%	2.1%	**34.9%**	-8.7%	**17.2%**
20	Portland, OR	-3.4%	-8.4%	-6.1%	-4.2%	-4.9%
20	Roseburg, OR	-6.0%	0.9%	3.2%	6.3%	-10.4%
20	Seattle, WA	5.6%	-9.3%	***	***	*program closed*
20	American Lake, WA	-11.7%	-1.2%	-2.8%	-7.4%	-5.9%
20	White City, OR	9.1%	3.3%	3.3%	-6.3%	**16.9%**
21	Honolulu, HI	***	***	***	-13.4%	-13.3%
21	Palo Alto, CA	***	-0.8%	3.4%	3.9%	-1.4%
21	Reno, NV	***	***	***	**22.4%**	-5.0%
21	San Francisco, CA	0.6%	-0.6%	1.6%	**15.0%**	**27.3%**

Table 36h cont. Adjusted Employment Status Unknown at Discharge, Direction from Median Site by Fiscal Year.†, ††

VISN	SITE	FY96 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY98 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY99 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY00 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %	FY01 Employment Status Unknown at Discharge %
22	Long Beach, CA	0.5%	4.7%	-10.4%	4.3%	-7.4%
22	Loma Linda, CA	-5.4%	0.7%	2.0%	-1.7%	5.0%
22	San Diego, CA	*n.a.*	***	-3.0%	0.7%	-7.7%
22	West LA, CA	***	***	**45.3%**	5.0%	***
22	Sepulveda, CA	***	***	***	***	***

† Improvement in employment unknown category has been adjusted for veteran characteristics and these characteristics vary within each fiscal year.

†† Sites that are statistically different from the median site in the undesireable direction, after adjusting for admission characteristics, are considered outliers and are shaded. In the table, the median site (the middle site where 50% of sites have values higher and 50% of sites have values lower) has a value of "0". Values reported for the remaining sites measure the distance and

*** Data is not recorded for site because the number of veterans is fewer than eleven (11).

**** Sepulveda did not submit any VI monitoring forms to NEPEC for FY 2001.

Appendix C
Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Data Tables

Appendix C.1 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by VISN.†

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	2,452	56.96	141.80
2	2,467	24.30	73.04
3	2,196	53.96	120.93
4	1,343	27.10	82.76
5	1,357	30.12	85.52
6	1,108	43.94	90.12
7	2,326	28.86	79.29
8	2,304	17.17	59.87
9	1,060	16.96	83.71
10	3,338	24.37	78.69
11	1,593	25.63	65.93
12	1,869	40.49	103.86
13	1,695	34.33	84.69
14	447	57.47	83.23
15	1,973	34.58	88.84
16	2,867	24.58	69.95
17	1,751	53.17	106.22
18	1,253	22.84	78.71
19	289	35.53	95.11
20	1,941	21.63	81.20
21	501	37.25	105.07
22	2,230	39.51	113.45
All VA	**38,360**	**33.11**	**89.29**
VISN Avg	**1,744**	**34.13**	**89.64**
VISN SD	**763**	**12.27**	**18.72**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 573 group IT, 535 individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance, 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT, 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.2 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by VISN.†

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	1,982	57.15	154.25
2	1,062	34.05	117.72
3	1,678	45.89	133.85
4	902	24.19	102.40
5	761	33.62	120.98
6	422	57.94	107.49
7	1,160	34.88	97.27
8	608	35.62	107.69
9	797	13.32	108.70
10	3,282	18.38	100.23
11	362	41.95	97.74
12	1,221	29.43	104.65
13	995	35.00	114.69
14	86	81.47	155.02
15	1,049	20.26	86.69
16	1,016	29.08	78.23
17	1,268	50.90	111.62
18	890	21.56	105.45
19	48	57.23	119.76
20	813	19.24	83.08
21	398	22.41	122.41
22	1,253	49.37	155.26
All VA	**22,053**	**33.92**	**113.71**
VISN Avg	**1002**	**36.95**	**112.96**
VISN SD	**674**	**16.44**	**20.96**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 - individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation and 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT.

Appendix C.3 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by VISN.†

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	459	43.58	172.20
2	258	62.80	120.18
3	536	49.48	123.44
4	342	25.20	69.82
5	430	26.57	112.14
6	454	41.83	140.38
7	543	41.37	121.90
8	191	31.73	91.34
9	85	35.53	79.97
10	575	36.22	96.97
11	338	55.44	135.57
12	608	45.99	133.30
13	474	40.00	107.57
14	105	68.76	165.05
15	667	62.96	111.01
16	883	26.51	64.16
17	345	77.24	172.11
18	177	19.72	93.70
19	124	51.97	122.80
20	907	14.33	84.75
21	106	88.53	160.37
22	199	52.32	130.59
All VA	**8,806**	**41.08**	**112.09**
VISN Avg	**400**	**45.37**	**118.60**
VISN SD	**234**	**18.36**	**30.78**

† Includes stop code 573 - group IT and 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT.

Appendix C.4 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by VISN.†

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (in days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop
1	473	13.49	140.89
2	2,135	3.55	81.51
3	1,054	14.20	81.93
4	658	9.04	63.53
5	727	5.31	90.87
6	868	6.05	92.65
7	1,109	3.79	69.59
8	1,885	6.29	78.51
9	311	13.95	120.73
10	42	4.69	38.31
11	1,469	4.71	66.48
12	846	13.92	115.83
13	817	5.38	78.86
14	406	28.23	103.73
15	914	5.44	62.97
16	2,100	8.34	80.86
17	542	3.55	61.66
18	756	7.86	100.66
19	269	4.00	106.26
20	1,181	11.30	76.55
21	80	4.45	95.20
22	1,496	10.59	106.91
All VA	**20,138**	**7.95**	**84.69**
VISN Avg	**915**	**8.55**	**87.02**
VISN SD	**587**	**5.62**	**22.79**

† Includes stop codes 535 - individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational ssistance and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.5 Type of Service Veterans First Received in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Continuum of Care by VISN.

VISN	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
1	2452	74.6%	16.3%	12.2%
2	2467	33.4%	7.7%	60.9%
3	2196	58.2%	16.7%	29.5%
4	1343	50.6%	11.5%	42.1%
5	1357	38.0%	21.6%	41.3%
6	1108	17.0%	27.2%	58.6%
7	2326	43.5%	15.9%	41.4%
8	2304	17.2%	7.6%	75.7%
9	1060	71.3%	2.5%	27.0%
10	3338	95.0%	5.8%	0.2%
11	1593	7.8%	11.7%	82.1%
12	1869	51.9%	24.6%	26.8%
13	1695	49.9%	11.7%	39.5%
14	447	11.4%	18.8%	82.8%
15	1973	47.7%	19.0%	33.9%
16	2867	17.2%	21.9%	61.8%
17	1751	62.2%	16.1%	22.5%
18	1253	52.4%	4.4%	45.7%
19	289	6.2%	22.8%	73.4%
20	1941	25.0%	26.4%	49.9%
21	501	74.5%	15.4%	10.6%
22	2230	42.7%	5.3%	54.6%
All VA	**38,360**	**46.0%**	**14.4%**	**41.5%**
VISN Avg	**1744**	**43.1%**	**15.0%**	**44.2%**
VISN SD	**763**	**23.8%**	**7.2%**	**22.6%**

Appendix C.6 Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.†

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
1	518	Bedford, MA	805	73.72	170.28
1	523	Boston, MA	659	43.38	133.08
1	631	Northampton, MA	343	64.02	122.71
1	650	Providence, RI	111	33.90	80.41
1	402	Togus, ME	120	56.83	185.53
1	689	West Haven, CT	378	50.24	127.35
1	405	White River Junction, VT	36	5.78	41.83
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	2,467	24.30	73.04
3	526	Bronx, NY	188	64.29	98.19
3	561	E. Orange, NY	690	47.02	104.84
3	620	Montrose, NY	398	57.40	116.90
3	630	New York, NY	363	22.97	100.90
3	632	Northport, NY	557	76.80	164.48
4	529	Butler, PA	168	12.66	59.89
4	542	Coatesville, PA	220	20.44	76.52
4	595	Lebanon, PA	467	28.60	91.97
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	66	5.77	97.85
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	368	43.10	92.01
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	54	3.17	18.22
5	512	Baltimore, MD	397	44.07	103.74
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	533	17.76	84.93
5	688	Washington DC	427	32.57	69.31
6	558	Durham, NC	123	2.52	16.35
6	590	Hampton, VA	700	46.96	93.82
6	652	Richmond, VA	40	4.65	54.98
6	658	Salem, VA	132	77.97	147.18
6	659	Salisbury, NC	113	44.51	93.24
7	508	Atlanta, GA	391	49.95	87.14
7	509	Augusta, GA	606	39.96	100.76
7	521	Birmingham, AL	183	10.96	135.07
7	534	Charleston, SC	113	5.80	84.66
7	544	Columbia, SC	263	3.01	43.04
7	557	Dublin, GA	85	20.42	44.74
7	619	Montgomery, AL	106	8.27	63.26
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	579	29.92	57.31
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	396	30.76	90.45
8	573	Gainesville, FL	432	19.30	75.34
8	546	Miami, FL	96	44.39	69.97
8	673	Tampa, FL	971	10.69	47.87
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	409	10.79	40.03
9	596	Lexington, KY	61	64.38	173.44
9	614	Memphis, TN	266	17.51	51.60
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	579	6.34	82.37
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	154	37.14	108.69

Appendix C.6 cont. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.†

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	716	33.70	87.61
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	297	18.79	58.61
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,741	20.52	74.49
10	552	Dayton, OH	584	27.27	90.50
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	840	22.99	60.17
11	550	Danville, IL	200	48.82	119.63
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	323	31.98	78.81
11	610	Marion, IL	230	6.23	22.17
12	578	Hines, IL	552	34.04	91.93
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	115	11.95	49.10
12	607	Madison, WI	100	13.08	116.04
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	416	74.93	137.31
12	556	North Chicago, IL	504	23.38	85.49
12	676	Tomah, WI	182	61.87	142.34
13	437	Fargo, ND	107	2.12	26.76
13	568	Fort Meade, SD	653	46.47	112.61
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	169	18.57	69.82
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	35	5.51	73.69
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	731	33.21	72.19
14	636	VISN 14 NE/IA	447	57.47	83.23
15	543	Columbia, MO	146	21.43	70.27
15	589	Kansas City, MO	545	7.47	29.53
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	3	167.00	290.00
15	657	St. Louis, MO	234	19.78	55.68
15	677	Topeka, KS	1,045	53.49	129.22
16	502	Alexandria, LA	277	7.57	62.28
16	520	Biloxi, MS	348	46.72	87.02
16	580	Houston, TX	346	22.98	62.92
16	586	Jackson, MS	160	7.65	56.22
16	598	Little Rock, AR	1,310	28.03	73.00
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	123	24.10	87.39
16	667	Shreveport, LA	303	10.71	52.38
17	549	Dallas, TX	892	51.22	104.86
17	671	San Antonio, TX	277	27.43	72.89
17	674	Temple, TX	582	68.42	124.16
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	529	24.28	91.34
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	109	8.76	32.97
18	649	Prescott, AZ	468	16.31	69.00
18	678	Tucson, AZ	147	48.93	98.08
19	554	Denver, Co	1	1.00	0.00
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	287	35.77	95.77
19	666	Sheridan, WY	1	1.00	0.00

Appendix C.6 cont. Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.†

VISN	SITE		# of Veterans Treated	Average # of PSR Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
20	463	Anchorage, AK	1	1.00	0.00
20	648	Portland, OR	311	44.13	94.28
20	653	Roseburg, OR	112	26.20	84.32
20	663	Seattle, WA	430	28.77	89.69
20	668	Spokane, WA	64	1.00	0.00
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	47	13.32	86.98
20	692	White City, OR	976	12.57	78.07
21	459	Honolulu, HI	72	41.81	105.69
21	612	Martinez, CA	128	65.56	134.30
21	640	Palo Alto	57	45.79	103.84
21	654	Reno, NV	243	19.12	90.21
21	662	San Francisco, CA	1	1.00	0.00
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	99	22.57	156.18
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	269	58.64	122.77
22	600	Long Beach, CA	1,020	19.89	89.20
22	664	San Diego, CA	118	67.43	127.67
22	691	West LA, CA	724	57.83	136.00
All VA			**38,360**	**33.11**	**89.29**
Site Avg			**372**	**31.40**	**86.14**
Site SD			**370**	**24.84**	**43.61**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 573 group IT, 535 individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance, 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT, 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.7 CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.†

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
1	518	Bedford, MA	721	68.84	182.38
1	523	Boston, MA	511	51.89	142.49
1	631	Northampton, MA	270	56.26	126.38
1	650	Providence, RI	111	33.90	92.97
1	402	Togus, ME	18	2.94	30.91
1	689	West Haven, CT	315	56.89	171.77
1	405	White River Junction, VT	36	5.78	68.45
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	1,062	34.05	117.72
3	526	Bronx, NY	188	63.02	105.09
3	561	E. Orange, NY	454	34.54	115.95
3	620	Montrose, NY	309	34.57	113.11
3	630	New York, NY	362	22.19	160.37
3	632	Northport, NY	365	84.28	165.90
4	529	Butler, PA	19	37.53	75.93
4	542	Coatesville, PA	175	19.90	110.57
4	595	Lebanon, PA	419	19.04	100.34
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	66	5.73	139.24
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	223	41.57	94.83
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	0		
5	512	Baltimore, MD	98	37.95	73.46
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	304	26.64	113.87
5	688	Washington DC	359	38.34	153.46
6	558	Durham, NC	11	5.91	51.80
6	590	Hampton, VA	326	60.46	104.06
6	652	Richmond, VA	24	6.63	85.43
6	658	Salem, VA	58	76.90	148.73
6	659	Salisbury, NC	3	18.33	91.50
7	508	Atlanta, GA	380	50.73	109.49
7	509	Augusta, GA	419	24.78	61.21
7	521	Birmingham, AL	183	10.13	156.57
7	534	Charleston, SC	2	17.50	23.50
7	544	Columbia, SC	42	7.19	57.61
7	557	Dublin, GA	13	16.08	76.70
7	619	Montgomery, AL	0		
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	121	69.45	122.04
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	281	30.03	100.24
8	573	Gainesville, FL	78	16.15	196.68
8	546	Miami, FL	60	50.57	86.31
8	673	Tampa, FL	141	41.88	93.06
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	48	62.92	97.29
9	596	Lexington, KY	0		
9	614	Memphis, TN	73	37.23	93.27
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	579	6.08	111.18
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	145	30.21	109.11

Appendix C.7 cont.CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.†

VISN	SITE	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	704	26.64	98.15
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	297	18.70	91.59
10	541	Cleveland, OH	1,724	16.97	105.14
10	552	Dayton, OH	557	12.14	93.78
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	212	25.73	57.54
11	550	Danville, IL	84	54.04	131.84
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	60	85.33	173.29
11	610	Marion, IL	6	11.83	66.20
12	578	Hines, IL	340	26.26	83.63
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	115	11.70	53.27
12	607	Madison, WI	100	13.08	152.68
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	239	49.31	150.66
12	556	North Chicago, IL	313	27.35	103.74
12	676	Tomah, WI	114	35.17	111.81
13	437	Fargo, ND	35	3.60	85.47
13	568	Fort Meade, SD	636	31.37	124.94
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	5	4.40	115.00
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	35	5.51	99.19
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	284	51.17	95.59
14	636	VISN 14 NE/IA	86	81.47	155.02
15	543	Columbia, MO	101	14.40	51.88
15	589	Kansas City, MO	380	3.70	42.00
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	3	167.00	290.00
15	657	St. Louis, MO	113	12.42	72.96
15	677	Topeka, KS	452	36.49	124.18
16	502	Alexandria, LA	66	22.44	46.69
16	520	Biloxi, MS	156	36.62	68.60
16	580	Houston, TX	161	31.47	64.47
16	586	Jackson, MS	6	40.67	49.50
16	598	Little Rock, AR	352	36.05	82.73
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	114	23.54	104.37
16	667	Shreveport, LA	161	10.39	111.59
17	549	Dallas, TX	747	59.64	117.65
17	671	San Antonio, TX	86	25.66	115.71
17	674	Temple, TX	435	40.87	98.95
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	284	24.11	147.80
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	57	7.86	45.35
18	649	Prescott, AZ	402	11.72	70.07
18	678	Tucson, AZ	147	48.86	134.75
19	554	Denver, Co	0		
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	47	58.43	119.76
19	666	Sheridan, WY	1	1.00	

Appendix C.7 cont.CWT and CWT/TR Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.†

VISN	SITE	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of CWT &/or CWT/TR Stops	Average Duration among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
20	463	Anchorage, AK	1	1.00	
20	648	Portland, OR	142	53.73	91.92
20	653	Roseburg, OR	16	11.88	137.31
20	663	Seattle, WA	168	29.04	95.50
20	668	Spokane, WA	64	1.00	
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	47	13.19	125.88
20	692	White City, OR	375	6.02	48.49
21	459	Honolulu, HI	26	64.81	203.10
21	612	Martinez, CA	82	10.84	117.22
21	640	Palo Alto	51	34.18	83.53
21	654	Reno, NV	239	19.26	124.76
21	662	San Francisco, CA	0		
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	99	22.54	219.01
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	260	58.65	145.00
22	600	Long Beach, CA	287	15.80	104.63
22	664	San Diego, CA	44	89.64	160.44
22	691	West LA, CA	563	63.78	163.73
All VA			**22,053**	**33.92**	**113.71**
Site Avg			**214**	**32.81**	**109.04**
Site SD			**251**	**25.88**	**43.18**

† Includes stop codes 574 - group CWT, 532 - individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation, 559 - group Psychosocial Rehabilitation and 208 Rehabilitation Medicine Service CWT.

Appendix C.8 Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
1	518	Bedford, MA	81	116.72	254.72
1	523	Boston, MA	199	9.91	146.35
1	631	Northampton, MA	48	89.71	160.38
1	650	Providence, RI	0		
1	402	Togus, ME	37	87.49	246.93
1	689	West Haven, CT	94	11.02	117.42
1	405	White River Junction, VT	0		
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	258	62.80	120.18
3	526	Bronx, NY	41	5.83	61.89
3	561	E. Orange, NY	55	99.58	199.90
3	620	Montrose, NY	323	29.85	78.14
3	630	New York, NY	5	14.60	45.50
3	632	Northport, NY	112	99.02	223.07
4	529	Butler, PA	11	10.09	16.33
4	542	Coatesville, PA	31	18.58	222.77
4	595	Lebanon, PA	133	19.20	36.34
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	0		
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	167	32.20	75.88
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	0		
5	512	Baltimore, MD	135	79.42	179.91
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	286	2.40	62.37
5	688	Washington DC	9	1.78	137.00
6	558	Durham, NC	0		
6	590	Hampton, VA	350	24.53	102.95
6	652	Richmond, VA	0		
6	658	Salem, VA	41	135.07	244.08
6	659	Salisbury, NC	63	77.27	185.15
7	508	Atlanta, GA	0		
7	509	Augusta, GA	370	36.93	128.61
7	521	Birmingham, AL	2	69.00	111.50
7	534	Charleston, SC	1	5.00	4.00
7	544	Columbia, SC	1	11.00	21.00
7	557	Dublin, GA	36	13.11	19.41
7	619	Montgomery, AL	40	8.25	100.21
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	93	84.32	151.41
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	120	25.72	72.72
8	573	Gainesville, FL	0		
8	546	Miami, FL	35	13.37	41.11
8	673	Tampa, FL	35	71.03	203.81
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	1	20.00	27.00
9	596	Lexington, KY	18	41.44	243.00
9	614	Memphis, TN	47	18.77	34.36
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	8	8.38	12.71
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	12	110.42	195.17

Appendix C.8 cont. Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	88	60.02	154.75
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	2	13.00	15.50
10	541	Cleveland, OH	296	21.73	64.45
10	552	Dayton, OH	189	48.09	123.59
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	137	76.69	177.72
11	550	Danville, IL	89	36.64	95.17
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	101	40.37	99.37
11	610	Marion, IL	11	81.27	235.60
12	578	Hines, IL	6	7.50	22.75
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	1	24.00	31.00
12	607	Madison, WI	0		
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	160	112.83	192.37
12	556	North Chicago, IL	355	7.37	69.09
12	676	Tomah, WI	86	84.05	216.65
13	437	Fargo, ND	1	13.00	20.00
13	568	Fort Meade, SD	199	49.58	100.81
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	86	13.84	187.78
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	0		
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	188	41.98	107.30
14	636	VISN 14 NE/IA	105	68.76	165.05
15	543	Columbia, MO	5	73.80	143.40
15	589	Kansas City, MO	54	29.56	43.87
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	0		
15	657	St. Louis, MO	130	24.76	44.47
15	677	Topeka, KS	478	77.01	135.65
16	502	Alexandria, LA	0		
16	520	Biloxi, MS	173	35.58	80.38
16	580	Houston, TX	238	10.35	47.42
16	586	Jackson, MS	1	78.00	114.00
16	598	Little Rock, AR	468	31.18	66.47
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	2	51.00	80.50
16	667	Shreveport, LA	1	16.00	21.00
17	549	Dallas, TX	5	14.20	27.25
17	671	San Antonio, TX	151	32.86	121.04
17	674	Temple, TX	189	114.37	212.33
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	84	29.19	87.85
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	30	14.30	105.18
18	649	Prescott, AZ	63	9.67	97.69
18	678	Tucson, AZ	0		
19	554	Denver, Co	1	1.00	
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	123	52.38	122.80
19	666	Sheridan, WY	0		

Appendix C.8 cont. Incentive Work Therapy (IT) Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of IT Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
20	463	Anchorage, AK	0		
20	648	Portland, OR	116	43.16	100.33
20	653	Roseburg, OR	1	4.00	23.00
20	663	Seattle, WA	249	23.63	100.44
20	668	Spokane, WA	0		
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	1	6.00	7.00
20	692	White City, OR	540	3.89	73.08
21	459	Honolulu, HI	22	46.05	131.45
21	612	Martinez, CA	48	156.31	238.55
21	640	Palo Alto	34	25.32	71.94
21	654	Reno, NV	2	3.50	27.00
21	662	San Francisco, CA	0		
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	2	1.50	18.00
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	1	39.00	53.00
22	600	Long Beach, CA	70	17.93	115.20
22	664	San Diego, CA	68	53.43	105.72
22	691	West LA, CA	58	94.50	182.37
All VA			**8,806**	**41.08**	**112.09**
Site Avg			**85**	**41.60**	**107.77**
Site SD			**116**	**35.80**	**69.78**

† Includes stop code 573 - group IT and 207 Rehabilitation Medicine Service IT.

Appendix C.9 Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
1	518	Bedford, MA	106	2.43	121.82
1	523	Boston, MA	27	3.63	83.13
1	631	Northampton, MA	261	9.43	112.35
1	650	Providence, RI	0		
1	402	Togus, ME	74	47.69	256.06
1	689	West Haven, CT	5	7.20	55.00
1	405	White River Junction, VT	0		
2	528	Upstate NY HCS	2,135	3.55	81.51
3	526	Bronx, NY	0		
3	561	E. Orange, NY	487	23.17	75.18
3	620	Montrose, NY	224	11.27	66.34
3	630	New York, NY	44	5.30	31.34
3	632	Northport, NY	299	3.10	129.09
4	529	Butler, PA	167	7.80	57.62
4	542	Coatesville, PA	95	4.62	63.76
4	595	Lebanon, PA	195	14.47	92.62
4	642	Philadelphia, PA	1	3.00	12.00
4	646	Pittsburgh, PA	146	8.30	42.35
4	693	Wilkes Barre, PA	54	3.17	29.82
5	512	Baltimore, MD	355	8.61	95.16
5	613	Martinsburg, WV	263	2.59	77.58
5	688	Washington DC	109	1.16	154.75
6	558	Durham, NC	123	1.99	80.16
6	590	Hampton, VA	597	7.66	97.64
6	652	Richmond, VA	16	1.69	50.63
6	658	Salem, VA	78	3.77	96.46
6	659	Salisbury, NC	54	1.98	28.00
7	508	Atlanta, GA	111	2.26	83.39
7	509	Augusta, GA	8	21.25	76.00
7	521	Birmingham, AL	4	3.50	25.67
7	534	Charleston, SC	113	5.44	125.70
7	544	Columbia, SC	227	2.11	74.99
7	557	Dublin, GA	75	14.07	44.49
7	619	Montgomery, AL	84	6.51	46.98
7	679	Tuscaloosa, AL	487	2.21	54.46
8	516	Bay Pines, FL	129	5.09	49.72
8	573	Gainesville, FL	386	18.33	109.11
8	546	Miami, FL	61	12.44	96.98
8	673	Tampa, FL	901	2.20	64.34
8	548	West Palm Beach, FL	408	3.37	85.06
9	596	Lexington, KY	52	61.17	207.07
9	614	Memphis, TN	242	4.37	94.97
9	621	Mountain Home, TN	13	6.62	36.10
9	626	Murfreesboro, TN	4	3.50	35.00

Appendix C.9 cont. Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
10	538	Chillicothe, OH	19	4.63	47.47
10	539	Cincinnati, OH	0		
10	541	Cleveland, OH	7	5.29	31.75
10	552	Dayton, OH	16	4.50	21.89
11	515	Battle Creek, MI	760	4.41	55.13
11	550	Danville, IL	178	11.03	113.27
11	583	Indianapolis, IN	314	3.61	98.75
11	610	Marion, IL	217	2.15	17.98
12	578	Hines, IL	435	22.56	121.52
12	585	Iron Mountain, MI	1	5.00	33.00
12	607	Madison, WI	0		
12	695	Milwaukee, WI	254	5.24	148.33
12	556	North Chicago, IL	152	3.99	45.80
12	676	Tomah, WI	4	5.75	19.00
13	437	Fargo, ND	73	1.21	111.36
13	568	Fort Meade, SD	23	22.96	38.86
13	618	Minneapolis, MN	82	23.49	173.51
13	438	Sioux Falls, SD	0		
13	656	St. Cloud, MN	639	2.90	68.90
14	636	VISN 14 NE/IA	406	28.23	103.73
15	543	Columbia, MO	84	15.55	112.66
15	589	Kansas City, MO	213	5.01	28.52
15	647	Poplar Bluff, MO	0		
15	657	St. Louis, MO	2	3.00	9.00
15	677	Topeka, KS	615	4.22	67.24
16	502	Alexandria, LA	230	2.67	132.38
16	520	Biloxi, MS	320	13.72	97.42
16	580	Houston, TX	149	2.82	25.71
16	586	Jackson, MS	160	5.64	91.59
16	598	Little Rock, AR	1,017	9.29	68.92
16	635	Oklahoma City, OK	65	2.75	77.80
16	667	Shreveport, LA	159	9.79	89.50
17	549	Dallas, TX	240	4.45	50.32
17	671	San Antonio, TX	176	2.44	90.41
17	674	Temple, TX	126	3.37	67.81
18	501	Albuquerque, NM	396	8.95	141.18
18	644	Phoenix, AZ	37	2.11	66.08
18	649	Prescott, AZ	322	7.17	66.46
18	678	Tucson, AZ	1	10.00	49.00
19	554	Denver, Co	0		
19	660	Salt Lake City, UT	269	4.00	106.26
19	666	Sheridan, WY	0		

Appendix C.9 cont. Vocational Assistance Services Delivered to Veterans during FY 2001 by Site.

VISN		SITE	# of Veterans Treated	Average # of Vocational Assistance Stops	Average Duration (days) among Veterans with more than 1 Stop†
20	463	Anchorage, AK	0		
20	648	Portland, OR	288	3.78	75.59
20	653	Roseburg, OR	97	28.25	105.83
20	663	Seattle, WA	160	10.06	116.42
20	668	Spokane, WA	0		
20	687	Walla Walla, WA	0		
20	692	White City, OR	636	12.43	65.95
21	459	Honolulu, HI	60	5.20	110.15
21	612	Martinez, CA	0		
21	640	Palo Alto	2	3.00	15.00
21	654	Reno, NV	17	2.18	36.14
21	662	San Francisco, CA	1	1.00	
22	593	Las Vegas, NV	0		
22	605	Loma Linda, CA	152	3.21	140.77
22	600	Long Beach, CA	949	15.27	103.47
22	664	San Diego, CA	92	4.13	137.46
22	691	West LA, CA	303	1.58	56.71
All VA			20,138	7.95	84.69
Site Avg			196	8.16	79.00
Site SD			289	9.47	43.61

† Includes stop codes 535 - individual Vocational Assistance, 575 - group Vocational Assistance and 213 Rehabilitation Medicine Service Vocational Assistance.

Appendix C.10 Type of Service Veterans First Received in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care by Site.

VISN	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
1	Bedford, MA	805	87.7%	8.6%	4.0%
1	Boston, MA	659	71.3%	28.4%	0.8%
1	Northampton, MA	343	55.7%	8.7%	55.1%
1	Providence, RI	111	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
1	Togus, ME	120	13.3%	27.5%	60.8%
1	West Haven, CT	378	78.8%	21.2%	0.0%
1	White River Junction, VT	36	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2	Upstate NY HCS	2,467	33.4%	7.7%	60.9%
3	Bronx, NY	188	92.6%	7.4%	0.0%
3	E. Orange, NY	690	47.0%	6.8%	52.2%
3	Montrose, NY	398	33.9%	54.5%	23.1%
3	New York, NY	363	99.7%	0.0%	0.3%
3	Northport, NY	557	50.8%	16.0%	35.0%
4	Butler, PA	168	0.6%	1.2%	98.8%
4	Coatesville, PA	220	65.0%	10.0%	27.3%
4	Lebanon, PA	467	65.7%	10.9%	33.4%
4	Philadelphia, PA	66	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
4	Pittsburgh, PA	368	44.3%	21.5%	35.1%
4	Wilkes Barre, PA	54	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
5	Baltimore, MD	397	9.6%	22.9%	69.0%
5	Martinsburg, WV	533	27.2%	37.3%	36.2%
5	Washington DC	427	77.8%	0.7%	21.8%
6	Durham, NC	123	3.3%	0.0%	97.6%
6	Hampton, VA	700	16.4%	28.6%	58.3%
6	Richmond, VA	40	60.0%	0.0%	40.0%
6	Salem, VA	132	32.6%	28.8%	43.2%
6	Salisbury, NC	113	1.8%	55.8%	42.5%
7	Atlanta, GA	391	93.9%	0.0%	7.4%
7	Augusta, GA	606	60.2%	40.3%	0.0%
7	Birmingham, AL	183	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7	Charleston, SC	113	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
7	Columbia, SC	263	14.1%	0.0%	85.9%
7	Dublin, GA	85	8.2%	31.8%	69.4%
7	Montgomery, AL	106	0.0%	36.8%	63.2%
7	Tuscaloosa, AL	579	9.0%	10.4%	80.8%
8	Bay Pines, FL	396	53.3%	27.8%	19.9%
8	Gainesville, FL	432	14.4%	0.0%	85.6%
8	Miami, FL	96	58.3%	35.4%	10.4%
8	Tampa, FL	971	5.7%	3.2%	91.2%
8	West Palm Beach, FL	409	2.9%	0.0%	97.3%
9	Lexington, KY	61	0.0%	16.4%	85.2%
9	Memphis, TN	266	12.4%	2.6%	88.0%
9	Mountain Home, TN	579	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	Murfreesboro, TN	154	93.5%	6.5%	0.0%

Appendix C.10 cont. Type of Service Veterans First Received in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care by Site.

VISN	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
10	Chillicothe, OH	716	95.5%	4.5%	0.0%
10	Cincinnati, OH	297	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	Cleveland, OH	1,741	96.6%	4.5%	0.0%
10	Dayton, OH	584	86.8%	14.0%	1.2%
11	Battle Creek, MI	840	6.8%	9.8%	85.0%
11	Danville, IL	200	19.5%	27.0%	56.5%
11	Indianapolis, IN	323	8.0%	12.4%	81.7%
11	Marion, IL	230	1.3%	4.3%	94.3%
12	Hines, IL	552	52.9%	0.0%	49.8%
12	Iron Mountain, MI	115	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Madison, WI	100	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Milwaukee, WI	416	38.7%	22.8%	41.6%
12	North Chicago, IL	504	38.3%	57.5%	10.1%
12	Tomah, WI	182	59.9%	41.2%	0.5%
13	Fargo, ND	107	32.7%	0.0%	67.3%
13	Fort Meade, SD	653	90.8%	9.5%	0.3%
13	Minneapolis, MN	169	1.8%	50.3%	47.9%
13	Sioux Falls, SD	35	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
13	St. Cloud, MN	731	24.6%	7.0%	70.3%
14	VISN 14 NE/IA	447	11.4%	18.8%	82.8%
15	Columbia, MO	146	68.5%	0.0%	31.5%
15	Kansas City, MO	545	68.6%	1.1%	30.3%
15	Poplar Bluff, MO	3	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15	St. Louis, MO	234	47.0%	53.0%	0.0%
15	Topeka, KS	1,045	33.9%	23.4%	43.8%
16	Alexandria, LA	277	21.3%	0.0%	78.7%
16	Biloxi, MS	348	9.2%	20.4%	73.9%
16	Houston, TX	346	15.0%	52.3%	33.2%
16	Jackson, MS	160	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16	Little Rock, AR	1,310	7.6%	28.7%	64.4%
16	Oklahoma City, OK	123	83.7%	0.0%	18.7%
16	Shreveport, LA	303	49.2%	0.0%	51.2%
17	Dallas, TX	892	75.9%	0.0%	24.2%
17	San Antonio, TX	277	11.6%	42.2%	46.2%
17	Temple, TX	582	65.3%	28.4%	8.6%
18	Albuquerque, NM	529	30.6%	2.5%	69.0%
18	Phoenix, AZ	109	46.8%	25.7%	29.4%
18	Prescott, AZ	468	63.5%	3.0%	37.4%
18	Tucson, AZ	147	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
19	Denver, Co	1	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
19	Salt Lake City, UT	287	5.9%	22.6%	73.9%
19	Sheridan, WY	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Appendix C.10 cont. Type of Service Veterans First Received in the Psychosocial Rehabilitation Teatment Services Continuum of Care by Site.

VISN	SITE	# of Veterans Treated	% Received CWT &/or CWT/TR Services First	% Received IT Services First	% Received Vocational Assistance Services First
20	Anchorage, AK	1	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	Portland, OR	311	12.2%	4.8%	83.3%
20	Roseburg, OR	112	13.4%	0.0%	86.6%
20	Seattle, WA	430	18.4%	49.3%	34.0%
20	Spokane, WA	64	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	Walla Walla, WA	47	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
20	White City, OR	976	24.8%	29.3%	47.8%
21	Honolulu, HI	72	22.2%	13.9%	66.7%
21	Martinez, CA	128	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%
21	Palo Alto	57	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%
21	Reno, NV	243	98.4%	0.0%	1.6%
21	San Francisco, CA	1	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
22	Las Vegas, NV	99	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
22	Loma Linda, CA	269	89.2%	0.0%	12.3%
22	Long Beach, CA	1,020	16.7%	2.3%	85.5%
22	San Diego, CA	118	17.8%	51.7%	31.4%
22	West LA, CA	724	58.3%	4.8%	38.1%
All VA		**38,360**	**46.0%**	**14.4%**	**41.5%**
Site Avg		**372**	**48.2%**	**14.8%**	**38.6%**
Site SD		**370**	**36.5%**	**18.8%**	**34.6%**